

1129. Also, petition of Thomas Dillon and 50 other citizens of Ada, Mercer County, W. Va., asking that Congress approve pension rates for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans, as suggested by the National Tribune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1130. Also, petition of George W. Damron and 68 other citizens of Dingess, Mingo County, W. Va., asking that Congress approve pension rates for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans as suggested by the National Tribune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1131. By Mr. SIMMONS: Petition of citizens of Sargent, Nebr., advocating increase of pensions for veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1132. By Mr. STALKER: Petition of citizens of Peruville, N. Y., urging Congress for the early passage of a pension bill increasing the pension of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1133. By Mr. THATCHER: Petition signed by Carl F. Ehman and others, Almond Jones and others, Eugene Hubbard and others, and Lee P. Brown and others, urging Congress for the passage of a pension bill increasing the pension of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1134. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of residents of Fulton County, Ohio, asking for legislation to increase pensions to Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1135. By Mr. THURSTON: Petition of Rhoda Kester, widow of a Civil War veteran, petitioning the Congress to enact legislation increasing pensions in behalf of Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1136. By Mr. WILLIAMSON: Petition of Edward Hitchcox and numerous other citizens of South Dakota, petitioning the Congress to pass certain legislation on behalf of Civil War veterans and the widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1137. By Mr. WOODRUFF: Petition from citizens of Midland County, Mich., favoring increased pensions for Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1138. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Belden Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill., urging opposition to increase in duty on China wood oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1139. Also, petition of Charles F. Smith, urging support of House bill 15573; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1140. Also, petition of A. A. Stevenson, 620 North Laramie Avenue, Chicago, Ill., urging support of House bill 14676; to the Committee on Pensions.

1141. Also, petition of Northwestern Yeast Co., Chicago, Ill., urging support of drainage tax relief bill (S. 4689); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

1142. Also, petition of V. G. Milum, secretary Illinois State Beekeepers' Association, Woodhull, Ill., urging passage of Senate bill 15386; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1143. Also, petition of post-office clerks of Eleventh Street station, Chicago, Ill., urging passage of La Follette-Meade bill (S. 3281); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1144. Also, petition of Mrs. William E. Hinchliff and Norma C. Thompson, urging passage of Norbeck game refuge bill (S. 1271); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1145. Also, petition of clerks, United States Post Office, Macomb, Ill., urging support of Saturday half holiday bill (S. 3116) and Dale-Lehlbach retirement bill (S. 1727); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1146. Also, petition of Costello & Packwood, attorneys at law, Chicago, Ill., urging passage of Senate bill 3281 and Senate bill 1727; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1147. Also, petition of employees of Greenville post office, Greenville, Ill., urging passage of Dale-Lehlbach bill (S. 3116) and La Follette-O'Connell longevity bill (S. 3282); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1148. Also, petition of Reba B. Smith, general superintendent of the National Crittenton Mission, Alexandria, Va., urging support of Senate bill 5492 and House bill 16529; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1149. Also, petition of Samuel Hazen Bond, attorney and counsellor at law, Washington, D. C., urging defeat of House bill 12203 (amended); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1150. Also, petition of William R. Vallance, president the Federal Bar Association, Washington, D. C., opposing House bill 16643; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1151. Also, petition of H. W. de Jarriette, Chicago, Ill., urging passage of House bill 14676; to the Committee on Pensions.

1152. Also, petition of Norwegian National League, Chicago, Ill., urging retention of the present mode of quota distribution based on the United States census of 1890; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

TUESDAY, November 19, 1929

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 30, 1929)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Fess	Johnson	Sheppard
Ashurst	Fletcher	Jones	Shortridge
Barkley	Frazier	Kean	Simmons
Bingham	George	Kendrick	Smoot
Black	Gillett	Keyes	Steck
Blaine	Glass	La Follette	Steinwer
Blount	Glenn	McCulloch	Stephens
Borah	Goff	McKellar	Swanson
Bratton	Goldsborough	McMaster	Thomas, Idaho
Brook	Greene	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Hale	Moses	Townsend
Broussard	Harris	Norbeck	Tamm
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Tydings
Connally	Hastings	Nye	Vandenberg
Copeland	Hatfield	Oddie	Wagner
Couzens	Hawes	Overman	Walcott
Cutting	Hayden	Patterson	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Hebert	Phipps	Waterman
Deneen	Heflin	Ransdell	Wheeler
Dill	Howell	Sackett	

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily detained on business of the Senate.

Mr. JONES. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] is also necessarily detained on business of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE FIRST DECADE OF NATIONAL PROHIBITION

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD A Study of the Social Effect of National Prohibition During its First Decade, by Dr. Ernest H. Cherrington, general secretary of the World League Against Alcoholism.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

Prohibition is no longer an experiment in the United States of America. From whatever angle we view this question it has passed beyond the testing point and has demonstrated its value. This is attested equally in the fields of economics, of health, and of sociology. Assailed as no other public policy ever has been assailed, it has weathered storms which would have sufficed to overthrow a measure that was less strongly established or that did not have behind it a tremendous volume of public sentiment.

Prohibition has done more than meet the expectations of those who for long years prior to the submission of the eighteenth amendment labored in its behalf. It has exceeded those expectations.

Because we are so close to the question many of us do not fully realize the tremendous achievements which are to the credit of national prohibition. Then, too, that easy forgetfulness which is so characteristic of humanity makes it difficult for us to compare the occasional violation of the law to-day with the chronic violations of the preprohibition era. We know that the prohibition law is violated. We forget too readily that the license or regulatory laws were violated so continuously that the popular assumption was that such violations were normal. The occasional sight of a public drunkard to-day rallies a crowd. Before the adoption of the eighteenth amendment drunken nuisances infested the streets and public places. There is significance in the fact that the hip flask, with its limited quantity of liquor, has taken the place of the quart and the decanter. We are dealing in fractions now when once we dealt in whole numbers with three figures. If it be true of the beverage-alcohol problem that "needs must that offenses come," it is none the less a great achievement to have made those offenses so closely approach the minimum.

Over five years ago Charles Edward Russell wrote of prohibition:

"The only test of prohibition that counts is economic, and Europe is getting ready to own, in ways to cause some astonishment, that under such proving American prohibition stands up well."

Russell was then discussing the question "Is the world going dry?" Many of the economic phases of this question have an even heightened emphasis with the development of the prohibition observance in the years since Mr. Russell wrote.

A special committee from Great Britain, under the chairmanship of Sir William Mackenzie, visited America to study our business conditions. In the official report rendered they declared:

"Prohibition is among the causes of America's industrial success. Its economic effect has been very great by the diversion of large sums into savings and the purchase of commodities and by increasing the regularity of attendance at work. This fulfills Lloyd George's prediction that 'If America holds onto prohibition 10 years Great Britain will be forced to go dry for economic reasons, as England half drunk and half sober can not successfully compete with sober and efficient America.'"

ECONOMICS OF PROHIBITION

In estimating the value of prohibition as an economic asset one must not ignore the fact that this national policy has its earlier years in a period when economic disaster would have been the normal expectation. It has become almost axiomatic that a great war was inevitably followed by a long period of industrial depression, if not by a financial panic. We had not forgotten the disastrous effect of the Civil War, nor ignored the long delay in resumption of gold payments until 1873. The natural expectation was that the greatest war in history would be followed by the greatest financial disaster. Here the stabilizing influence of prohibition entered. There was a sag in employment and in production and in distribution. Losing foreign markets and passing through the difficult period of adjustment of exchanges our whole factory system naturally was forced to slow up the ratio of production. This naturally was reflected in domestic trade, in the employment of workers, and the rates of wages as well as the hours of labor. There was no panic, however. There were no bread lines, no soup kitchens. Charity organizations did not find any long list of applicants for doles. Instead of all these expected disasters we merely noted a slowing up in the business mechanism of the Nation, to be followed by a slow, healthy, steady development.

In some States where careful business statistics are kept, such as in Pennsylvania, for instance, it was noted that while the amounts paid in wages had greatly decreased, the amounts laid aside in savings banks did not appreciably decrease, but even, in some places, increased. This was unprecedented. There was only one factor entering the business situation that could account for it. All the other factors would account for a threatened, if not actual, panic. The new beneficent factor was prohibition. Sums formerly expended wastefully were now being conserved in savings or being expended constructively. This is not the opinion only of prohibition propagandists but is generally realized by our greatest business experts.

Roger W. Babson, of the Publishers' Financial Bureau, of Babson Park, Mass., is generally recognized throughout the Nation as an authority on the trend of business. As are most other business men of the country, he is a friend of the prohibition law. In a remarkable statement issued some time ago, Mr. Babson says:

"Both friends and enemies of prohibition must agree that the increased purchasing power of the masses, which has been so general since the war, is largely due to prohibition. Increased wages are not responsible for this increased purchasing power, because higher wages mean higher prices and do not materially affect the volume of goods purchased. When, however, a man takes money formerly thrown away on harmful drink and uses it for buying a home, an automobile, or any other merchandise, he is greatly aiding all legitimate industry. This means that a great sum formerly spent in saloons each year, and from which only the brewers benefited, has gone into new buildings, automobiles, and the hundreds of other lines which have expanded so readily since prohibition went into effect."

While Secretary of Commerce, Herbert Hoover made a study of our factory production. He summed up his results of this survey in these words:

"There can be no doubt of the economic benefits of prohibition. Viewing the temperance question only from this angle, prohibition has proved its case. I think increased temperance over the land is responsible for a good share of the enormously increased efficiency in production, which statistics gathered by the Department of Commerce show to have followed passage of the prohibition law. Exhaustive study from many angles of production over average periods, 10 years apart before and since the war, would indicate that while our productivity should have increased about 15 per cent, due to the increase in population, yet the actual increase has been from 25 to 30 per cent, indicating an increase of efficiency of somewhere from 1 to 15 per cent."

"There is no question, in my opinion, that prohibition is making America more productive. There can be no doubt that prohibition is putting money in the American family pocketbook. The dry law has proved its worth in dollars and cents."

Henry Ford has emphasized this relation between our present prosperity and prohibition. In a recent article he asserts:

"Without prohibition industry would of necessity decline to the position it occupied at the beginning of the century. Without prohibition a short working week and day would be no longer possible. Without prohibition accurate workmanship would be impossible."

"The reason why America is so far ahead of other countries industrially to-day, the reason America is so rich to-day, is prohibition."

Foreign countries want America for their market because America, under prohibition, has the money. Their own countries, where liquor still runs free, are too impoverished to be profitable. That is the doom of the drink business—it ruins its own customers."

In order properly to evaluate Mr. Ford's utterances on the subject, it is necessary to consider the standpoint from which he views this entire question. While we are all aware of Mr. Ford's preeminent position as an industrialist, there are other factors entering into his decision beyond those arising from his position as a manufacturer. Some time ago Samuel Streuss, in the Atlantic Monthly, discussing this question, analyzed the situation so clearly that I can not do better than to present the results of that analysis here.

"When Mr. Henry Ford, who is a man born into his time, says we must give up either drink or industrialism, he is not moved to say so merely because drink would make people buy fewer automobiles. Instinctively he understands that drink makes people buy less of everything, and so less of automobiles. When Mr. Gary says that drink and prosperity are incompatible, he is not moved to his conclusion by mere questions of efficiency in the steel mills. * * * Under the old order, the products of brewery and distillery added up in the prosperity columns just as steel did, and plows and corn; beer and liquor were equal with all the others. Under the new order, drink subtracts from the total. Drink cuts down general consumptive power. Drink takes from the Nation's ability to use up goods; drink takes from a man's efficiency to consume; drink lessens the desire for things. Drink, to be sure, limits its own consumption; when it has its men under the table, that is the end; there is a limit to the amount a man can drink. But what is intolerable is that drink makes inroads into the consumption of all else. Consumption can not suffer drink because in drink men find a substitute for that satisfaction which is in the acquiring of luxuries; the pleasure in drink takes the place of the pleasure in things. The more things men have, the more they need—this is the working philosophy of consumptionism. The more drink men have the less things they need. Consequently, we have the eighteenth amendment."

SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

Probably there is no better index to prosperity than the savings accounts of the Nation. While these are only a part of the total savings, which include life insurance, permanent investments, home buying, etc., they probably mirror more accurately than any other single factor the better condition of the wage earners of the country. Before prohibition the savings deposits of the Nation were not any very great factor in our financial life. Many banks then did not care to handle such deposits, since they were small and required costly attention.

In 1918, according to the figures in the report of the Comptroller of the Currency, the amounts of these savings were: Private banks savings, \$23,459,823; postal savings banks, \$148,471,499; loan and trust companies, \$1,286,650,369; State banks savings, \$1,071,636,806; mutual savings banks, \$4,442,096,393; stock savings banks, \$1,001,573,414; national banks saving departments, \$1,398,358,000; total, \$9,372,246,304.

The fiscal year 1928 registered a record gain in savings-bank deposits, although the various years since the adoption of the eighteenth amendment had marked the addition of large sums to this stored-up capital of the people of the country. In an analysis of the report of the United States Comptroller of the Currency, W. Espy Albright, deputy manager of the American Bankers' Association's savings bank division, says:

"The year ended June 30, 1928, registered over the previous year the largest gain in savings deposits in banks and trust companies of continental United States ever recorded in the history of this country. On June 30, 1928, the volume of savings stood at \$28,412,961,000, a gain of \$2,327,059,000 over the previous year. * * * Since 1912, when adequate records first became available, the gain per inhabitant is 169.3 per cent. * * * The number of depositors, which, for 1917, was reported at 48,354,784, reaches a high mark this year with 53,188,348."

The American banker recognizes the part played by the eighteenth amendment in developing our gains in savings deposits and finds that although it would be impossible to determine exactly, "the influence of prohibition in building the savings-bank totals of the country; that it has had some bearing will be admitted even by those who do not particularly favor the prohibition amendment."

LIFE INSURANCE

The life insurance data of the country is another index of the economic gains made under prohibition. Since the adoption of the eighteenth amendment our annual purchase of new life insurance has been multiplied three and one-half times. Over 65,000,000 people now carry life insurance amounting to \$100,000,000,000. It was recently stated by the Association of Life Insurance Presidents that we had attained during the first half of 1929 the one hundred billion dollar goal. It took 80 years, from 1843 to 1922, to accumulate the first \$50,000,000,000 of life insurance in force, while the second fifty billion was attained in less than 7 years. Mr. George T. Wight, manager of the Association of Life Insurance Presidents points out:

"The economic and social ramifications of this \$100,000,000,000 of life insurance in force are of great importance in the daily lives of our citizens. Guaranteeing economic independence to millions of individuals,

and temporary financial relief to many more millions, contracts binding the aggregate payment of this amount are now in the hands of more than 65,000,000 policyholders, who are representative of every walk of life."

The Insurance Field in September, 1929, commented at great length upon the economic gains from prohibition. In the course of its article it said:

"What we particularly want to see discussed fairly is the relation of prohibition to the economic system of insurance as importantly incidental to and with the general welfare. How much of the evident savings from the annual alcoholic drink bill has gone into life insurance, building and loan associations, savings banks, and the many comforts of living? * * *

"How is the life insurance aspect affected by the diversions of the drink bill? The industrial issues have more than doubled since 1920. More of the industrial classes have stepped up to the higher figures of ordinary. These jumped from \$35,000,000,000 in 1920 to more than \$100,000,000,000 this year. Where did it all come from? Say the agency forces did it by hard work. Very well; but where did the money come from to pay for it? That is the economic vein that can be opened by every company and by all experienced agencies for their own guidance. Has prohibition advanced the general welfare, or has it merely dried out cocktail glasses? It is a business and not a moral, personal-liberty matter with insurance."

HOME BUILDING

Prohibition gave a new emphasis to the home-building impulse. Many who during the saloon epoch were forced to live in slums or in unspeakable tenements because the major portion of their income went across the bar are to-day knowing a new comfort and a new ambition. The best authorities in realty and building circles recognize the part played by prohibition in developing the new market for homes. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, in its recent review of building operations in the first half of 1929, calls attention to the fact that in 85 cities in the United States having a population of 100,000 or over, building permits issued in the first half of 1929 call for an expenditure of \$1,425,106,688 of which 64.1 per cent was for residential building.

There is a double significance in this stimulation of home building. Not only does it register the improvement in home conditions and the higher standards of living which have developed since prohibition but this increased volume of construction means labor and employment for a host of men engaged in the building trade.

The following comparative figures on building and loan associations, taken from the annual reports of the Comptroller of the Treasury, show the remarkable development of the home-building impulse under prohibition:

Year	Number of building and loan associations	Members	Assets
1914.....	6,616	3,103,935	\$1,357,707,900
1915.....	6,806	3,334,899	1,484,205,875
1916.....	7,072	3,586,432	1,598,528,136
1917.....	7,269	3,838,612	1,769,142,175
1918.....	7,484	4,011,401	1,898,344,346
1919.....	7,788	4,289,326	2,126,620,390
1920.....	8,633	4,962,919	2,519,914,971
1921.....	9,255	5,809,888	2,890,764,621
1922.....	10,009	6,864,144	3,342,530,953
1923.....	10,744	7,202,880	3,942,939,880
1924.....	11,844	8,554,352	4,765,937,197
1925.....	12,403	9,886,997	5,509,176,154
1926.....	12,626	10,665,705	6,334,103,807
1927.....	12,804	11,336,261	7,178,562,451
1928.....	12,666	11,995,905	8,016,034,327

THE AUTOMOBILE'S RELATION TO PROHIBITION

The automobile industry has a very intimate relation to prohibition. Even before Henry Ford made his famous statement, "If booze ever comes back to the United States, I am through with manufacturing," and "gasoline and booze don't mix; that's all," thinking people realized that intoxicating beverages could not be safely permitted if we were to continue to use high-speed automobiles on our public highways. The auto death list is already too high. If the saloon should return or if under any system drink should be legalized once more, few of us would care to run the risks incident to traveling on a road infested with drinking drivers.

Aside from all other considerations, anything which might seriously affect the automobile industry in America would be a calamity. We now lead the world in the production of automobiles, 9 out of every 10 machines being made in this country, according to the Department of Commerce survey.

Since, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics in its August, 1929, study of Trend of Employment and Labor Turnover, the number on the

August pay roll in 217 establishments, producing automobiles, was 437,202, while the amount of the weekly pay roll was \$15,098,523, one is forced to realize that any national policy which threatens an industry of this caliber would be a positive disaster to the business structure of the country. If we add, however, to these figures the 58,240 engaged in production of automobile tires with the weekly pay roll of \$1,685,032 and then add to these those employed in filling stations, garages, accessory manufacturers, and retailers, it is quite evident that anything which seriously disturbs the automobile industry would at the same time shake the very foundations of our industrial life. If prohibition had done nothing more than make possible the amazing development of the auto trade in the past 10 years, it would have made an incalculable contribution to the economic life of the Nation.

Dr. Thomas Nixon Carver, professor of economics in Harvard University, in an article entitled "Some Economic Aspects of Prohibition," published in October of this year, incisively portrays phases of prohibition in which the ethical is involved with the economic. He writes:

"The good which President Lowell and other observers agree that prohibition has done is economic as well as moral. It has been of special advantage to the wage-workers and their families. Not having to run the gantlet of a row of saloons on the way home from work, not being subject to the treating habit which the liquor interests assiduously cultivated, they have been able to take more of their wages home to their families. The families are, therefore, better fed, housed, clothed, and they have more opportunities for amusement as well as for self-development. The industries which provide necessities, amusements, and means of cultivation are now getting most of the money that was formerly spent on drink. Automobile manufacturers, the manufacturers of radio sets, the whole moving-picture industry, would, therefore, better think several times before they lend any influence in favor of the repeal or nullification of the prohibitory law. If the subversive movements ever succeed, much of the money now spent for these things will again be turned over to the liquor interests in the purchase of drink."

CRIME AND PROHIBITION

Prohibition has played an important part in reducing the criminality in the United States. Long before the adoption of this national policy, bar associations and other organizations concerned about the future of our Nation pointed with dismay to the rising tide of crime and warned us that it threatened to engulf our civilization. Crime commissions and vice commissions were formed in various parts of the country to study the question and suggest remedies. Prisoners' aid societies, probation and parole systems, prison reforms, and other panaceas failed to check the mounting list of crimes perpetrated all over the Nation. Those interested in the abolition in the licensed liquor traffic urged that the closing of the saloons and the prohibition of beverage intoxicants would probably reduce the amount of crime. Their views were scouted as the pleas of too-enthusiastic partisans.

National prohibition did come, however, and the crime wave which had been mounting so steadily for decades was checked and began to decrease. This is the verdict not only of ardent prohibitionists but of the best-informed experts in this highly specialized field of sociology. Dr. George W. Kirchwey, formerly dean of Columbia Law School and one of the leading authorities on criminology in the United States, denying that crime is increasing in this country, declares that:

"As between 1910 and 1923, the latter date being the high-water mark of reaction against national prohibition, there was a decrease of 37.7 per cent in general criminality in the United States in proportion to population. The chief reductions were in public intoxication, 55.3 per cent; disorderly conduct, 51.5 per cent; vagrancy, 52.8 per cent; fornication and prostitution, 55.7 per cent; malicious mischief, etc., 68 per cent; larceny, 53.1 per cent; and burglary, 11.4 per cent."

Judge Herbert G. Cochran, of Norfolk, Va., acting president of the National Probation Association, addressing that organization at its convention in San Francisco last June, pointed out that "Despite the increase in population in the Nation, actual commitments dropped one-third from 1913 to 1923, and the ratio has not increased materially since."

To this be added: "A lot of new crimes have been created by new laws, and there has been an increase in some types of crime and a decrease in others. Burglary has decreased and hold-ups and other bold youthful crimes have increased."

It is highly difficult to obtain exact data concerning the amount of crime in the United States. When the National Crime Commission was formed the Hon. Charles E. Hughes, one of its members, decided that the first question to be answered in surveying the situation was, Is there a crime wave? The Association for Municipal Research, when asked by the commission to furnish some figures on crime, found there were no statistics available and estimated that the cost of a survey in all the States would be about \$1,000,000 and would require six months. This, however, would only cover the statistics of the previous year.

This suggests the difficulties in the way of securing any adequate information on the crime situation throughout the country.

Possibly the best data we have is that contained in the census of prisoners, taken by the Census Bureau, and comparing the years of 1923 and 1910. This census shows a decrease of 1.7 per cent in the prison population of the latter year compared with the former. It also shows a decrease of 37.7 per cent in the total number of commitments during the year. Some of the decreases are extremely interesting. Among them we note the following: Drunkenness commitments, 55.3 per cent; disorderly conduct commitments, 51.5 per cent; vagrancy, 52.8 per cent; larceny, 52.3 per cent; assault, 53.1 per cent; prostitution, 28.8 per cent.

These figures, of course, do not give the exact situation. Before prohibition persons convicted of drinking and related offenses were usually punished by a fine. In many communities the courts have been more severe since the adoption of national prohibition, thus increasing the percentage of prison or jail sentences imposed upon the smaller number of prisoners arraigned. Had it not been for this increased severity the decrease in such commitments would have been even greater than it is. It is especially noteworthy that commitments of prisoners under 18 years of age showed a decrease of 43 per cent for 1923 as compared to 1910. Of course, the establishment of new juvenile institutions and reformatories took care of many youthful lawbreakers in this period. The increase, however, reported by juvenile reformatories in this period is estimated by the Census Bureau at about 5,085. These would in former years have been sent to jail or some other penal institution.

The Federal Children's Bureau in its study of juvenile delinquency finds that in 1880 offenders between the ages of 18 to 20 furnished 11.8 per cent of all commitments; in 1890, 12.1 per cent; in 1923, 9.4 per cent. Prof. Irving Fisher, of Yale, in his recent book, *Prohibition Still at Its Worst*, analyzes the crime figures for New York and finds:

"In the alcoholic record of New York City there is nothing to warrant the widely heralded belief that prohibition has debauched American youth. On the contrary, first convictions for drunkenness in that city, in which youth have a principal share, have diminished more rapidly, even, than the total yearly convictions for drunkenness."

If we try to find just who is committing the crime which to-day disturbs the Nation and which has caused appointment of the special commission of law enforcement, many would read with profit from the census of prisoners:

"The ratio of commitments per 100,000 population during the year 1923 was highest for negroes, 797.1 per 100,000. The Indian, Chinese, Japanese, and other colored races ranked next, with a combined ratio of 666.9 per 100,000. The ratio for foreign-born whites was 488.5 per 100,000. The native whites had the lowest ratio, 239.4 per 100,000. Thus the foreign-born whites had a ratio more than twice as large as the ratio for the native whites. This difference is due in large part to the fact that the foreign-born population includes a much higher proportion of adult males than the native-white population. If the comparison is restricted to adult males 15 years of age and over, the ratio is 878 per 100,000 for the foreign born as compared with 703.2 per 100,000 for the native."

Long ago Theodore Roosevelt said: "The liquor traffic tends to produce criminality in the population at large and lawbreaking among the saloon keepers themselves."

Possibly no other single public policy ever played so large a part in striking at the causes of crime as did the adoption of national prohibition. It made intoxicating beverages difficult to obtain instead of easily accessible; it made them costly instead of cheap; it eliminated the saloons and their back rooms, which were the rendezvous for criminals and the school of crime. Its effect may be measured not by the too fervid utterances of its friends or its foes but by the criminal data of almost any town or city in the country. Lawlessness is of course far too prevalent. Judge Marcus Kavanagh, of Chicago, in his recent book *The Criminal and His Allies*, clearly presents the issue which confronts the Nation when he says:

"The next five years will decide whether the American people in this regard are capable of self-government."

Judge Kavanagh does not find that prohibition is responsible for the creation of crime but rather, discussing the altering conception of crime and of personal liberty, he reminds us:

"It is true that certain ages and certain climates have regarded crimes such as adultery, polygamy, and drunkenness as bad in themselves, while in other times or in different climates they were considered not even *malum prohibitum*, or bad only because the law forbade. In these latter countries and times such acts were not considered atrocious and interferences with the just rights of others, while in other countries such conduct was esteemed an atrocious offense against decency and public morals. It is the just right of every citizen that the surroundings of the community in which he and his family must live, which he helps to support and must defend with his life when called upon, shall be what his country and his age deem sober, decent, and moral. Who-

ever infringes upon the concept in a way forbidden by law commits a crime."

PROHIBITION AND THE PUBLIC HEALTH

The effect of prohibition upon the public health has been as marked as its effect upon the economic life of the country. This can likewise be measured by statistics whose authenticity is beyond question. While there had been a slight yearly decrease in the national death rate in the preprohibition years, that decrease was so small that it was barely perceptible upon the ordinary chart. With the coming of prohibition, however, the death rate for the country dropped abruptly. It has not even remotely approached the ratio for the license period. According to the figures issued by the department of vital statistics in the United States Census Bureau, this decrease in the death rate has been equivalent to the saving of 100,000 to 200,000 lives per year. In other words, nearly 200,000 persons would have died annually during the past 10 years had the conditions prevailing during the license period been continued.

When we closed the doors of 177,000 licensed saloons and uncounted numbers of speak-easies which had been operating practically unchecked for decades, we also closed centers of infection and contagion. Of course, those hundreds of thousands whose lives were saved by prohibition would not all have died drunkards' deaths even if prohibition had not been introduced, but they would have died just the same. They would have died of other diseases than alcoholism. Their power of resistance would have been weakened. The possibility of contagion would have been multiplied. Lower standards of living, less nourishment, and greater exposure would all have contributed, through indulgence in alcoholic beverages, to hasten their end.

Dr. Haven Emerson, professor of public health at the Columbia University, New York, some time ago summed up the relation of national prohibition to the public health in words which are worth repeating. He said:

"While it is not possible to prove that all the reductions of sickness and death rates, and all the benefits to the home and the family which have been widely observed throughout the United States in recent years have resulted from the outlawing of the commercial traffic in alcoholic beverages, it is both evident and wholly reasonable to believe that the greatest single influence, not previously brought to bear upon the conditions of life in our country, which has caused in whole or in part the improved security of life, the greater material wealth and better standards of the family and the home, especially among the mass of wage earners and particularly as affecting women and young people, has been the reduction in the use of alcohol for beverage purposes."

Doctor Emerson also lists as the more important items offered as evidence of benefits due chiefly, if not wholly, to the direct and indirect results of prohibition:

"The death rate from alcoholism fell to 19 per cent of the preprohibition rate, and in spite of subsequent rises the rate is now less than 75 per cent of the preprohibition rate. Only in the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, where the violations of the law have been most flagrant and public opinion strongly alcoholic, has the death rate from alcoholism in any single year since preprohibition equaled the average rate of the last seven preprohibition years."

"The death rate from cirrhosis of the liver fell to 54.3 per cent and has never been nearer than 57.4 per cent to the preprohibition rate."

"The general death rate (all ages, all causes) has for the entire postprohibition period been at a lower level than in any single year before prohibition."

"Admissions to mental-disease hospitals for alcoholic psychoses have been at a lower rate in proportion to all admissions since prohibition than for any previous similar period of time."

"There has been apparently a reduction in the incidence of cases of drug addiction coming under hospital care at the same time that there has been a reduction in hospital admissions for acute alcoholism."

This corroborates what Dr. Eugene L. Fiske, of the Life Extension Institute, once said when discussing the abnormally high death rate of employees in breweries:

"The general trend of this mortality is the same in all companies, and shows that 'Old Mortality' and 'John Barleycorn' are exceedingly good cronies. Wherever you find alcohol you find the following formula at work: 'More alcohol—higher death rate.'"

More recently still Louis I. Dublin, Ph. D., statistician of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., in his book "Health and Wealth," relates the improvement in public health to the improvement in economic conditions in the great mass of American homes since prohibition, affirming this with an earnestness which is more significant because of his characteristic restraint.

Horatio M. Pollock, of the New York State Department of Mental Hygiene, and Frederick W. Brown, of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene, have in the past few weeks published some unusual statistics on recent alcoholic mental diseases. The following quotations from their survey are so significant that it is hardly necessary for one to point the moral which they contain:

"The nine States that were 'wet' before prohibition contributed more than 90 per cent of all cases of alcoholic insanity in 1922, 1925, and 1926. The percentage of alcoholic cases among all new admissions to these hospitals for the years 1922, 1925, and 1926 shows a steady increase. The percentage of alcoholic cases among all new admissions and readmissions to these hospitals in 1926 was less than one-half of that of 1910, but slightly greater than that of 1922 or of 1925. * * *

Miss Cora Frances Stoddard, of the Scientific Temperance Federation, has carefully analyzed the alcoholism mortality statistics of the various States as furnished by the United States Census Bureau. She finds:

"From 1901 to 1917 the alcoholism death rate averaged 56 per million population, or about the rate of 1916 (58 per million). Under national prohibition the highest rate in any year (1926) has been 39 per million. The smaller proportion of people of the United States who now die of alcoholism are no 'deader' than those who succumbed between 1901 and 1917, so that honest consideration of this health aspect of the alcohol problem by health officials anxious to prevent loss of life is to be welcomed as an evidence of keener appreciation of the importance of this loss of life than they formerly showed."

As background facts to any consideration of the alcohol death rate Miss Stoddard sets forth the following:

"There were about 16,000 fewer alcoholism deaths in the first seven prohibition years than there would have been had there prevailed the average preprohibition rate of the years 1912-1917. In 1926, the latest year for which United States statistics are available, there were fewer actual deaths from alcoholism in a registration area of 105,000,000 people than there were in 1916 from 71,000,000 people.

"Where is alcoholism worst? If there is to be a campaign for reducing alcoholism, it is important to know the strategic points where it is most menacing and increasing fastest. What, to use a familiar phrase, are the serious 'centers of infection'? They are the former wet States and the great cities. Certain facts indicate this:

"The joint alcoholism death rate in 1926 of 15 former nonprohibition States was 4.8, in 27 former prohibition States it was 2.5, per 100,000 population. These former nonprohibition States contained nearly 54 of each 100 people of the registration area; they furnished 67 of each 100 alcoholic deaths. There were 23 States in 1926 which had less than 50 alcoholic deaths each. Their total population was about two and one-half times that of New York State, but they furnished a total of only 545 deaths to New York's 788. Twenty of these States had adopted State prohibition before the eighteenth amendment came into effect.

"Fourteen of the twenty-three States had fewer than 25 alcoholic deaths each. Their combined population was about equal to that of New York. They reported 233 deaths; New York, 788. All of the 14 were prohibition States except two (Vermont and Delaware, together furnished only 25 alcoholic deaths).

"New York and Maryland. These two States contain about 12 per cent of the population of the registration area, but furnished 22 per cent of the alcoholic dead in 1926. New York is especially responsible; containing 10 per cent of the registration area population, it contributed over 19 per cent of the alcoholic dead. New York City with about 5 per cent of the aforesaid population, contributed over 18 per cent of the alcoholism deaths in the United States in 1926. Wyoming and Rhode Island also have an excessive disproportion between population and alcoholism, but furnished only 70 actual deaths in 1926. It is no wonder that Doctor Nicoll found New York State 'wet,' politicians chary about taking up the question of checking alcoholism mortality for fear it would increase the demand for a State prohibition enforcement law.

"There were 14 States in 1926 whose alcoholism death rate was above the national average. Ten of them are former nonprohibition States. There were 28 States at or below the average rate; 23 of them former prohibition States. There were 27 former prohibition States in the registration area in 1926; 11 of them had less than half the national alcoholism death rate. Of the 4 prohibition States exceeding the average rate, 3 (Washington, Michigan, and Florida) are at points especially accessible to smuggled liquor, while the first 2 contain 2 of the 20 largest cities in the United States (Seattle and Detroit).

"It is evident that in general the alcoholism mortality problem is most serious in the former wet States; is below the average in the former prohibition States.

"The great cities. In 1926, 20 of the largest cities in the registration area contained about 20 of each 100 people in the United States. But they furnished about 45 of each 100 alcoholism deaths. It is evident that the largest part of the alcoholism problem centers in the former wet States and in the large cities, some of which are in former dry States. Michigan and Washington, for instance, mentioned above among the States having an alcoholic death rate, are undoubtedly affected by their large cities, Detroit and Seattle, to both of which Canadian liquor is easy of access."

The following table gives the actual number of deaths and death rates in the United States registration area from 1914 to 1919, inclusive:

Year	Actual deaths	Rates per 100,000 population
1914.....	3,257	4.9
1915.....	2,945	4.4
1916.....	4,161	5.8
1917.....	3,907	5.2
1918.....	2,193	2.7
1919.....	1,367	1.6

The following table of the death rate from alcoholism as it is and as it might have been in the United States registration area is highly suggestive:

Year	Actual deaths	What there would have been at the average preprohibition rate, 1912-1917
1920.....	900	4,562
1921.....	1,611	4,624
1922.....	2,467	4,862
1923.....	3,148	5,057
1924.....	3,155	5,149
1925.....	3,694	5,361
1926.....	4,109	5,465
	19,084	35,080
Gain.....		19,084
		15,996

ENFORCEMENT OF PROHIBITION

Prohibition is neither perfectly enforced nor is it universally observed by the American people. Of course, no law is perfectly enforced or unanimously obeyed. The violations of the prohibition law, however, while more numerous than we might wish are not sufficiently so to seriously affect any of the gains made possible by this national policy. These violations are exceptions to the rule. They are committed by a small minority of the American people. Their effect is imperceptible so far as any of the business indicators of the Nation are concerned. Illegal consumption of intoxicating beverages is not affecting our output, our savings, or our retail trade; neither does it register any remarkable figure in the accident toll taken by the automobile traffic. If the Nation to-day was consuming any important fraction of the amount once used, the results would be immediately discernible in these statistics. Before prohibition we were drinking quantities which seem almost incredible now. Then the national drink consumption was mounting yearly. In 1917, the last year of comparatively unrestricted sale under license, according to the United States Statistical Abstract, 1922, page 697, we consumed 42,723,376 gallons of wine; 1,885,071,304 gallons of malt liquors; and 167,740,325 gallons of distilled spirits. These wines contained over 6,500,000 gallons of pure alcohol (the dry wines ranging from 12 to 14 per cent and the port and sherry from 18 to 24 per cent alcohol). The distilled spirits contained 83,870,000 gallons of pure alcohol. The malt liquors contained 75,402,852 gallons of pure alcohol. This makes a total beverage consumption of pure alcohol in 1917 of 165,772,000 gallons. Those who maintain that the Nation is drinking as much as ever must show where such a quantity of alcohol is obtainable, illicitly, to-day. Probably the highest estimate of diverted alcohol claimed that 90,000,000 gallons of hard liquor or 55,000,000 gallons of pure alcohol was entering bootleg channels and this estimate was based on a misconception of alcohol withdrawals.

If the per capita ratio of 1918 continued to-day, we would be consuming over 2,400,000,000 gallons of intoxicants. That would mean an average of 20 gallons per year for every man, woman, and child in the United States. Those who claim that we are drinking as much as before prohibition do not realize the serious traffic problem that would be involved in moving this amount of liquor clandestinely from the manufacturer to the retailer and to the consumer.

If each and every automobile in the United States were to transport 100 gallons of this liquor, there would still be 100,000,000 gallons untransported. Allowing 8 feet between cars, this would mean 136,363 miles of cars, or over 45 strings of automobiles stretching across the United States to carry the liquor that would be consumed in the United States in 1928 were it not for national prohibition.

VIOLATIONS OF THE LAW

The enemies of prohibition attempt to establish the popular impression that liquor law violations are so general and so widespread that they "make a farce of prohibition enforcement." In order to give "an air of verisimilitude to a bald and unconvincing narrative," the propa-

gandists for the brewers, distillers, and vintners quote the arrests for violations of the prohibition laws and even cite the seizure of distilling apparatus as though this were evidence of the failure of the law. Rather are these facts evidence of the increasing enforcement of the law. Re-

ports of arrests, seizures, etc., by Federal prohibition officers alone, since the effective date of the national prohibition act do not suggest any abatement of their efforts. The following are the official figures compiled under the direction of the Commissioner of Prohibition for this period:

Report of arrests, seizures, etc., made by Federal prohibition officers since the effective date of the national prohibition act

	Period from Jan. 17 to June 30, 1920	Fiscal year ended June 30—							
		1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928
Illicit distilleries seized.....	4,645	9,746	8,313	12,219	10,392	12,023	12,227	14,512	16,220
Illicit stills seized.....	4,888	10,991	10,994	14,000	15,853	17,854	12,248	11,881	18,980
Illicit still worms seized.....	2,218	5,182	10,203	7,512	8,211	7,850	6,974	8,024	9,133
Illicit fermenters seized.....	21,111	70,014	81,640	124,401	124,720	134,810	130,530	173,656	217,278
Gallons of distilled spirits seized.....	137,772.38	413,987.32	382,390.44	457,365.25	1,672,743.81	1,102,787.65	1,247,520.08	1,462,532.76	1,048,636.84
Gallons of malt liquor seized.....	1,637,483.00	4,963,005.27	4,187,625.67	4,803,872.92	5,379,528.03	7,040,537.30	14,220,551.93	5,971,903.35	4,254,029.58
Gallons of wine, cider, mash, and pomace seized.....	95,672.90	428,303.88	4,052,213.88	9,085,411.34	8,774,916.80	10,572,933.50	13,273,738.10	21,736,395.24	27,171,567.06
Number of automobiles seized.....	209	706	1,886	3,977	5,214	6,089	5,935	7,137	6,934
Number of boats and launches seized.....	3	23	74	134	236	182	187	353	81
Total appraised value of prop- erty seized.....	\$1,262,196.67	\$8,181,866.70	\$5,872,062.09	\$11,478,277.53	\$10,843,881.83	\$11,199,664.46	\$13,835,524.85	\$24,540,338.03	\$23,204,345.20
Number of agents injured.....	0	13	28	45	28	39	50	59	89
Number of agents killed.....	0	14	9	11	2	7	6	6	10
Number of persons arrested.....	10,548	34,175	42,223	66,936	68,161	62,747	58,391	64,986	75,307

Behind these figures there lie many interesting facts not always realized by the mass of people. The illicit distilleries may be anything from a little hovel or a shack in the woods to a large barn or other building converted into a factory for the production of illicit liquor. Many of them have very limited capacity. None of them, of course, were comparable to any distillery in the preprohibition days. In fact, it would take hundreds of these so-called distilleries to equal one of the distilleries which operated legally before the adoption of national prohibition.

So with the illicit stills, worms, and fermenters, which have been seized. Some of these stills had a capacity of only a few gallons. Others had a large capacity. The larger the still, however, the greater the chance of its being detected and wrecked by officials before it had gotten fairly into operation. The distinctive odor of the mash can not be concealed. The problem of disposal of the mash after distilling introduces another element which increases the chances of detection. Many of these stills never produced a gallon of spirits to enter the market. The fermenters cited in the report may be anything from a pan to a vat. A score or more may belong to a single still. The fact that these were seized and wrecked and that the liquor produced was confiscated and destroyed indicates some degree of efficiency on the part of Federal prohibition officers.

If other evidence were required in regard to the enforcement of prohibition, the price of bootleg liquor, which is frequently quoted in the press, should be persuasive.

That there are weaknesses in enforcement no person will deny. It is inevitable that there will be such weaknesses. It is possibly equally undeniable that the quality of enforcement is continuously increasing. When one considers the limited number of agents actually at work on the enforcement of this law, one may be surprised at their achievements. Especially is this true when we remember that some States like New York State and Maryland give no aid in the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment, although the legislatures of those States ratified it.

Prohibition has proven its worth. That it is no longer an experiment does not need citation of authorities or the presentation of elaborate statistics. Even the most casual observer can see for himself the change which has been wrought in America by this national policy. It has so transformed conditions in our social life that it is difficult to-day for us to think ourselves back into the setting of the preprohibition era. We have in this brief space of less than a decade become accustomed to streets and public places free from drunkards. We take for granted now prosperity which is merely one of the by-products of prohibition. We assume as a normal condition the better health and the improved living conditions which have become general. We may not always recognize that behind these things and underlying them as well there is the eighteenth amendment. It is there none the less.

Prohibition came as the only possible solution to the liquor question. There was an alternative, but only one alternative and that alternative meant a surrender to the most antisocial custom humanity has known. It meant reversing the trend of American civilization. It meant substituting for this high-powered, high-velocity culture which has set this Nation in the forefront of the world, a more or less alcoholized condition of national life with its inevitable accompaniments of crime, pauperism, and unhappiness. America had to choose between progress with prohibition or retreat and defeat under a liquor license program. It chose prohibition and progress. There is to-day no intimation that the majority of the American people are seriously contemplating reversing this position.

The liquor traffic had thousands of years in which to demonstrate its possibilities for evil. The national prohibition policy has had less

than a decade to show its possibilities for good. Those 10 years were sufficient however. Prohibition is the established American custom of dealing with an ancient but inexcusable social menace.

The opposition to the eighteenth amendment to-day is largely financed by a few wealthy men. Besides the personal gratification from their own consumption of legalized intoxicating beverages should their efforts succeed, there is also a tremendous money prize as the reward for a wet victory. The normal expenditure on intoxicating beverages, now diverted to legitimate business, is not less than \$5,000,000,000 a year, according to Dr. Paul H. Nystrom, professor of marketing, School of Business, Columbia University. The investments of the millionaire wet group in antiprohibition propaganda are very small compared to the enormous amounts at stake. The diversion of this tremendous total from the usual avenues of retail trade would affect not alone our entire distribution machinery, including department stores, groceries, etc., but would seriously disturb our production rate. The dollar spent for liquor could not be spent for automobiles, radios, furniture, or other items in the long list of American products now consumed in record-breaking totals by the American people. The whole structure of our prosperity would be imperiled.

Industry is being mechanized so rapidly that any considerable disturbance of our consumption ratio would most seriously affect our employment problem. As President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, pointed out last December at the New Orleans convention of that body, "One of the most important problems affecting labor to-day is the displacement of workmen by machines and by devices which automatically do the work once done by trained men." A decrease in the consumption ratio in this mass-production age would probably throw out of employment more workers than have ever been jobless at any previous period of our industrial history. If even one-half of the drink bill as estimated by Doctor Nystrom were diverted from the purchase of our factory products to the purchase of intoxicating beverages, the results would be disastrous to the workers of the country. The balance to-day between production and distribution is so delicate that one can not face with equanimity the possibility of its being so violently disturbed.

There is no likelihood of prohibition legislation being repealed or seriously weakened so long as the temperance forces of the country are organized. Because of this the enemies of this social policy are making their strongest efforts to discredit or to destroy the organized activities of the strongest prohibition groups.

The propaganda against prohibition has been terrific. If the same assault had been made on other laws it is highly probable that these laws would have become dead letters long since. It is noteworthy that rarely has this propaganda touched the fundamental questions involved in prohibition. It has rather been confined to such unsupported assertions as that prohibition can not be enforced. This argument is not so much against prohibition as against the form and the efficiency of our system of government. Another argument of the antiprohibition propagandists asserts that the people are not in favor of prohibition. That plea has not been heard so frequently since the last general election, although previous elections, each of which returned to Congress a larger number of friends of prohibition than its predecessor, had sufficiently evidenced the popular strength of this cause.

The adoption of some other plan as an alternative to prohibition is repeatedly suggested by those who are more concerned with getting the eighteenth amendment out of the Constitution than they are with the quality or the effectiveness of a substitute for it. It is interesting to note that the liquor interests always have been for something else rather than the actual policy toward liquor which is either under con-

sideration or on the statute books at the time. Usually they are for the last thing which had been secured by the dry forces. When first the Colonies adopted systems to regulate and restrict the liquor traffic, the liquor interests opposed this in favor of free and open privilege. Then the license system was first discussed; they fought this and advocated regulation.

When government control of liquor through the dispensary system was tried in some of our States the liquor traffic was against the new proposal and in favor of its predecessor, the license system. When local option began to win contests in the villages and townships the liquor interests were against this and advocated in its stead either the dispensary or license or regulation. When county prohibition was proposed the liquor interests urged the advantages of home rule in village and town local option. When State prohibition was adopted the liquor forces urged that county and local option were the ideal methods. When finally national prohibition was adopted the liquor interests, which had fought losing fights all through these various stages of the conflict, united and opposed national prohibition and invoked in its stead State rights. Now that national prohibition is a fact and world prohibition looms in the offing, one may confidently expect that the liquor interests of the world, running true to form, will oppose world prohibition and urge in its stead the advisability of purely national prohibition.

The only alternative to prohibition is permission. All the various systems of so-called control or regulation of the beverage-liquor traffic depend upon prohibitions. The only question seems to be what degree of restriction or prohibition shall we have. In all the liquor-control systems which have ever been advocated by the opponents of prohibition it has been the prohibitory rather than the permissive features which have mitigated the evils of beverage alcohol.

I challenge any spokesman for those opposed to prohibition to cite one instance in 300 years of American history where the permissive features of any license or regulatory liquor law has been responsible for any mitigation of the evils of the alcoholic traffic! I challenge him to show a single case where whatever mitigation was secured did not arrive from the prohibitory features of the law, purely! Since this is true, where is there any reason for substituting any degree of permission for any degree of prohibition?

From whatever angle one views our American life one can see that prohibition fits exactly into the picture puzzle completing the pattern of our civilization. Equally can one see that the introduction of beverage alcohol would not only disturb but utterly ruin that pattern. There is no place for it. No place can be made for it without peril. Whether we like it or not, we must recognize the cold truth that legalized beverage alcohol is as dead as the last century, to which it belonged.

FREEDOM OF THE SEAS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD several articles dealing with the freedom of the seas and the forthcoming naval conference in London.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The articles are as follows:

[From the New York Times, November 9, 1929]

PARLEY WON'T TOUCH ON FREEDOM OF SEAS—MACDONALD, AT THE LORD MAYOR'S BANQUET IN LONDON, DECLARES ISSUE WILL NOT BE RAISED—SEES IT BASED ON WAR FEAR—HE HOLDS PROBLEM WILL BE NON-EXISTENT WHEN MEN'S MINDS ARE FREED OF THIS MENACE—HAILS ESTABLISHED PEACE—SAYS IT IS IN PROSPECT AND LEAGUE'S FROWN WILL SOON BE MORE DREADED THAN NATION'S ARMS

LONDON, November 9.—Prime Minister MacDonald to-night gave firm and emphatic assurance that the question of the freedom of the seas would not come before the 5-power naval conference.

Speaking in London's historic Guildhall at the annual lord mayor's dinner, he declared:

"It might be convenient and pacifying if I assure you that a certain statement that appeared to-day that this important question was to be raised at the coming 5-power conference has no basis or justification whatever. No such question has been raised by any government so far as I know, and I think that I happen to know what has been done. No such question has been raised in connection with the 5-power conference, and I venture to say that it will not be raised at all."

It was the first time that such a definite pronouncement on the subject had come from a high authority either in Washington or London. The Premier took advantage of the brilliant audience and the state occasion to settle the matter beyond all doubt. His statement was received with deep interest by the leaders of London's official and diplomatic life, and especially by the Japanese and French ambassadors, who sat near him at table.

BASED ON OUTWORN FEARS OF WAR

The problem of the freedom of the seas would vanish, continued the Premier, as soon as outworn fears of war vanished from the minds of men.

"Everyone working in the front trenches of the peace army has always been impressed by how the great public outside, instead of fearing war, fears peace," he said.

"Such questions as the freedom of the seas arouse at once old feeling, old cares, old points of view, and once again public opinion takes up the old position. The thing we have got to do—the work that His Majesty's present Government will strive with might and main to do—is to get people to see in the proper proportion and relations the meanings of these questions.

"Put the problem before the lawyers to define clauses that are water-tight and you are putting before them a problem that is absolutely impossible. Put it before those admirable men who can use their skill and knowledge—the expert, responsible leaders of our military departments—and they can not solve it for you.

"But when you remember that the problem of the freedom of the seas, either naval or military, can only arise if bugles have been blown, surely every man and woman of common sense sees that the swiftest and surest method of solving these problems is to see that the bugles of war never blow again."

TESTIFIES TO GOOD WILL HERE

Ambassador Dawes, now on the high seas, was unable to represent the United States at the lord mayor's dinner and the Premier, therefore merely testified to the spirit of good will he had found in America, and expressed his hopefulness as to the approaching conference.

"The American ambassador and I have been trying to remove difficulties which prevent not only agreement between America and ourselves but agreement with other nations," he declared. "Until America and ourselves have removed our difficulties it is no use trying to get other nations to remove theirs.

"I crossed to see President Hoover because I believe in personal contact. By dispatches you can deliver the letter, but only by personal contact can you deliver the spirit. If negotiations on delicate subjects are to be successfully conducted, both the letter and the spirit must be apparent to those conducting the negotiations.

"America is more enthusiastic about the future than about the past. Its objective is good will and cooperation in promoting good objects. There is no cooperator who can do more than this country in pursuing the common objectives which we have. Now, as a result of it all, we are to meet in London at the naval conference. That, I believe, will mark very substantial progress in the stage of universal disarmament."

REVIEWS LABORITE POLICY

Mr. MacDonald's speech, the first ever delivered in such surroundings by a Labor Prime Minister, was a sweeping review of the Government's policy abroad and at home. Beneath the Guildhall's lofty ceiling, under which Woodrow Wilson was made a freeman of London 11 years ago, the Premier pointed to the advancing fortunes of world peace in a field ranging from Russia to South America and from the dominions to the Balkans. The League of Nations, he asserted, was steadily growing in moral authority and becoming the world's surest bulwark for security and peace.

"Its frown will soon be more dreaded than a nation's arms," he exclaimed and the audience applauded him to the echo.

"The prospect in front of us is the prospect of established peace," he declared in ringing voice. British troops, he told his hearers, were already marching home from the Rhineland and the French were following. The reparations problem, he declared, had been settled by The Hague agreements, which, he said, "will restore to a very considerable measure at any rate, fair play to certain sections of British trade that had been hardly dealt with by the working of reparations."

PRAISE FOR BRIAND

If Mr. MacDonald had any fears over the possible policy of the new Tardieu ministry in France, he did not betray them to-night. Instead he told of his satisfaction that M. Briand was still in charge at the Quai D'Orsay.

"Those of us who carry on the foreign affairs of this country ought to congratulate ourselves most heartily that in the coming negotiations, which we are now preparing for and looking forward to with hope, M. Briand is to be the custodian of the French interests and a colleague of ours in pursuing the policy of international peace," he asserted.

[From the Washington Post, November 10, 1929]

A CERTAIN EXCLUSIVENESS

"The very coming together of the Anglo-Saxon countries," says the London Times, "has provoked doubts and even resentment. Sinister motives have been attributed, malevolent comment has been made. A certain necessary exclusiveness has no doubt contributed to these misrepresentations of the nature of the work achieved. Now is the time, in the interval that remains before January, to amplify and to explain it."

It may be added that Prime Minister MacDonald's oblique references to the understanding reached at Washington have helped to confuse, rather than clarify, the public mind abroad as to the nature of the

understanding. That a large portion of the British public believes that an entente has been formed between the "Anglo-Saxon countries," constituting a virtual naval alliance, is undeniable. Another section of British opinion accepts Mr. MacDonald's suggestions with a grain of salt, and suspects that he made no real progress in the direction of an Anglo-American entente, notwithstanding the air of mystery thrown about the "necessary exclusiveness" of the conversations at Washington.

From the American point of view it is necessary to the success of a general naval conference that the relations between Great Britain and the United States should be made perfectly clear. If France and Italy should become convinced that Great Britain and the United States have agreed upon a program to be made effective at the naval conference, the nature and scope of which are to be kept secret, the conference will inevitably fail. No one could blame either France or Italy for refusing to promote an Anglo-Saxon understanding whose ramifications are unknown to them. Between the lines of the courteous replies from France and Italy are seen the reservations which stand in the way of an accord. M. Leygues, French Minister of Marine, stated the other day that France's acceptance of the invitation to the London conference "in no way tied the hands of the Government as to the range of the problems to be discussed at the London conference, and the Government, in fact, reserved its entire liberty of action. We shall have reservations to formulate, but they will be made at the proper time."

What is the limit of the understanding that is to determine British and American policy at the naval conference? To what extent is the United States committed? The British and American people do not know. The joint statement hints that the "practical policy" of both Governments is to be directed according to the understanding reached. In America this "practical policy" is easily assumed to be aimed at the establishment of naval parity with Great Britain, and nothing more. In England the people are led to believe that this "practical policy" is aimed at much more than naval parity. To them it means that Great Britain and the United States have agreed to force the European naval powers to abolish submarines, the deadly menace to British naval supremacy. With submarines abolished the British Navy dominates the Mediterranean, whether France and Italy agree to naval parity or not. With France and Italy free to build submarines, the Mediterranean could be closed to the British fleet.

In London it is stated that the invitation to the conference is substantially a joint invitation, in which the United States joins; and the invitation declares that both the British and American Governments have publicly taken a stand in behalf of the abolition of submarines. This is not true as to the United States Government. On the contrary, the law provides for submarines, and the Washington treaty reinforces the law.

What is the intention of the political delegation that is to deal with American naval affairs at the proposed conference? Has an understanding been reached whereby that delegation will join the British delegation in demanding that submarines be scrapped? The public has a right to know whether or not an attempt is to be made to change the nature of the defenses of the Panama Canal, Hawaii, and all other American territory. Are Senators REED and ROBINSON to be bound as delegates to a policy which they would not approve as Senators? They may find themselves in a very uncomfortable position when they are made acquainted with the instructions which bind them to an Anglo-American understanding.

STATE DEPARTMENT POLICY ON NAVAL ARMS DISCUSSIONS SCORED AS LACKING CANDOR

The State Department defiantly continues to conceal from the public the exact nature of the agreements arrived at during the recent Hoover-MacDonald conversations, disregarding the obvious propriety of determining the sentiment of the country concerning private settlements vital to the public welfare previous to an attempt to translate them into treaties. Public sentiment, and certainly not the private opinions of Hoover nor those of the State Department, should shape finally the attitude of the American delegates to the coming London naval parley.

Although hemmed in by a purposeful silence, Hoover's intentions may fairly be surmised by his failure to name Senator HALE and other recognized Senate advocates of an adequate Navy to membership in the naval delegation. Obviously, his purpose is to name only those who will accept for the United States, in furtherance of private agreements, something less than the naval parity expressed by the clear tonnage equivalents recognized by the Washington treaty, a course which would bind this country forever to naval, and therefore political, inferiority to Britain and handicap its normal development.

It is beyond refutation that if England were seeking a genuine peace agreement, with peace only in mind and not merely pursuing the present negotiations to secure a selfish advantage, there would be no hesitancy on MacDonald's part in acknowledging the fairness of applying the 5-5-3 tonnage ratio to all classes of warships, including cruisers; nor would the British fail to abandon voluntarily their preposterous pretensions to the privilege of searching and seizing neutral American ships and goods on the high seas during British wars. England, however, refuses to consider an equal naval strength, and not only refuses to

discontinue the molestation of neutral commerce in war time but actually proposes to legalize that policy by securing international consent to a perversion of the purposes of the Kellogg pact.

The American delegation to the London naval conference should be emphatically instructed to break off negotiations should England continue to deny the fairness of actual tonnage parity between the American and English fleets. Coolidge wisely instructed the delegates to Geneva to safeguard the American interest on the same point, and then by securing the passage of the cruiser law, which Hoover now seeks to nullify, forced England to modify her demands.

Very truly yours,

STEPHEN DECATUR GRACE.

[From the Washington Post, November 9, 1929]

NOT PREPARED

If it be true, as the London Times asserts, that the invitation to the London naval conference is, in everything but form, an "Anglo-Saxon" invitation, it may be presumed that the Washington administration will feel bound to do all in its power to have the ground properly prepared beforehand in order that the conference will be a success.

That there is no adequate preparation for the conference is apparent in each of the nations concerned, except Japan. The Japanese program is definite and agreed upon, and the delegates have been chosen. They know what maxima they will demand and what minima they will accept. Their main object is to obtain from the United States a concession which will enable Japan to build a larger proportion of cruisers. This readjustment of naval strength would still further reduce relatively the naval strength of the United States, upon which the security of the Panama Canal, Hawaii, Alaska, and the Philippines depends. Who knows whether or not the United States is prepared to make this concession? No American naval expert has been selected as a delegate to London, and it seems to have been determined that no one competent to pass upon technical naval questions will be one of the plenipotentiaries.

London has not named its delegates. Does anyone suppose that the British delegation will be destitute of naval experts, when the fate of British naval supremacy hangs in the balance? No doubt the British delegation will have a very clear idea of what it wants and what its irreducible minimum will be. But the British public is not prepared for the disappointments that may arise when it is revealed that the United States has not agreed to operate its fleet in accordance with British policy, either in peace or war. Sooner or later the British public will become aware of the fact that the American President is not empowered to make such an agreement, even if he should wish to do so. Articles appearing in the British press convey the unmistakable impression that the British public is convinced that an understanding has been reached which constitutes a guaranty that the United States Navy will not clash with the British Navy in case Great Britain, as a belligerent, should assert the right to capture neutral commerce. This is a false impression which may make no end of mischief. Public opinion in Great Britain should be clarified before the conference is held.

Foreign Minister Briand has achieved a great triumph in the French Chamber of Deputies, and it is now a certainty that he will take a much stronger position in developing France's policy. France is not compelled to make concessions of any sort to Italy. Premier Mussolini, on the other hand, has already made demands upon France which the latter regards as excessive and unallowable. Obviously, a disagreement between these Governments on naval policy would disrupt the naval conference. They must not only agree beforehand, but their agreement must be acceptable to Great Britain, the United States, and Japan if the conference is to succeed.

A postponement of the conference, in the interest of a successful issue of its labors, now seems probable. Since the Washington administration has become in part responsible for calling the conference, the American people will be doubly anxious to avoid the deplorable consequences of failure. One fiasco like that of Geneva is enough. It has taken two years to bring about a better feeling in which the nations are willing to confer. Another failure would set back the cause of naval limitation for an indefinite period, during which untoward events might work havoc with all peace plans.

The frantic desire of the present British Government to rush through a naval program on the strength of vague understandings reached with the United States is intensified by the fact that Prime Minister MacDonald is in a precarious position, depending upon his political opponents for the votes that would keep him in office. But this fact should not influence other governments in hastily entering a conference so momentous as that which affects their security and peace. Each should take ample time to prepare its case, consult other governments, and lay the foundations of an agreement.

[From the Washington Post, November 19, 1929]

NAVAL EXPERT NEEDED

The idea of excluding naval experts from the American delegation to the naval limitation conference is inexplicable to the American people. It would be bad enough if all the interested powers were to

follow this suggestion, but when some of the nations refuse to be guided by this rule it is manifestly unfair to ask other nations to adopt a policy of self-imposed ignorance of the subject matter to be discussed.

According to London dispatches, the British Government has urged the Governments of France, Italy, and Japan not to appoint admiralty delegates and it is an open secret that Great Britain in this instance is acting as agent for the United States. But Japan has already appointed Admiral Takarabe as one of her delegates, and it is blandly suggested here that this one exception should not affect the proposed rule. The fact that Japan has a naval expert on her delegation is not regarded as justifying the inclusion of an American naval expert on the delegation which is to represent the United States, according to the view taken by the State Department.

When the Japanese delegation visits Washington next month to confer with the American delegations on highly controversial and extremely technical matters pertaining to the Japanese demand for an increased cruiser ratio, the American Navy will be represented by Secretary Stimson and the Japanese Navy will be represented by Admiral Takarabe.

The Japanese admiral-delegate is one of the ablest naval experts in the world. He combines broad knowledge of international affairs with an intimate knowledge of every technical detail pertaining to naval problems. He has served as minister of the Japanese Navy in five cabinets. He has seen actual service in the lower naval ranks and distinguished himself in naval battles during the Russo-Japanese War. He is an unexcelled negotiator and has the reputation of being able to outmaneuver and outwit the most skillful statesmen when naval matters are involved.

Mr. Stimson, who will represent the United States Navy in the conferences with Admiral Takarabe and who will later formulate America's naval policy at the London conference, has been taking lessons from members of the General Board during the past three weeks or more. He has frankly admitted that the lessons were sorely needed, and it may be assumed that he is proving an apt pupil and now knows more about the Navy than a former American Secretary of State who was amazed and horrified to discover that a battleship was hollow.

But with all the diligence and aptitude in the world, Mr. Stimson will necessarily remain in the primer class for many months in so far as technical naval knowledge is concerned. It is not fair to require him to pit his naval knowledge against that of Admiral Takarabe or naval experts on other delegations. It would be unfair to select a person who had never played golf and ask him to take lessons for three weeks and play a match with Bobby Jones or Tommy Armour.

The suggestion of a naval conference with the exclusion of naval experts from the delegations appears as impractical as it is unnecessary. It is something like playing the next Davis cup match with all persons who know anything about tennis excluded from the match. If all teams agreed to this it would be at least fair, but if France named Henri Cochet by way of exception the novices would be handicapped just as civilian delegates, with no knowledge of naval problems, will be handicapped by the inclusion of a past master like Admiral Takarabe on the Japanese delegation.

President Hoover wants the London conference to be limited strictly to consideration of naval problems. These problems, as affecting the United States Navy, are understood best by the Americans who have devoted their lives to the study. If any nation sends a naval expert as delegate to the London conference, all other nations should be given the same advantage. It is a dangerous thing to subject the fate of the United States Navy to amateurs who will go up against foreign experts.

CHEMISTRY AND THE AIRPLANE IN PEACE AND WAR

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a very interesting letter from Maj. Gen. H. L. Gilchrist, Chief of the Chemical Warfare Service, with reference to questions relating to war and peace and the airplane.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE CHIEF CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., October 18, 1929.

Senator JOSEPH E. RANDELL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR RANDELL: Due to my absence from Washington, I have delayed somewhat in answering your letter of October 8 inclosing a copy of Mr. Garvan's message to the American Chemical Society as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This message had, of course, come to my attention through the newspapers, and I had already written Mr. Garvan.

A careful reading of Mr. Garvan's statement, however, convinces me that his thought should be summed up somewhat differently than in your letter. Mr. Garvan does not infer that chemistry, in conjunction with the airplane, will insure the peace of the world by making war so horrible that nations can not engage in it; but rather that the possessor

of weapons based on these great scientific developments can make war so effectively as to make it impossible for weaker nations along these lines to engage in it.

This is a proposition to which I have given much thought; and I am inclined to believe that the way to peace is not through making war horrible. In fact, I am inclined to think that any war of to-morrow will not be more horrible than those of the past. Wars of ancient days were infinitely more terrible than those of recent times, and yet wars have continued as instruments of national policy. Improvements in weapons have tended to reduce the percentage of deaths on the field of battle, and the laws of war have given increasing protection to non-combatants.

History proves beyond a doubt that with the improvements in methods of warfare mortality and suffering have been lessened. In the World War we had poison gas, airplanes, machine guns, and various forms of high explosives which theoretically might exterminate any army, but a careful survey of the casualties shows that the loss of life proportionate to the number engaged was not nearly as large as in our own Civil War.

When man was less civilized war meant extermination or slavery for the vanquished, civilian as well as soldier. The wounded were ruthlessly slain, cities sacked and burned, crops destroyed, and women and children killed or enslaved. War could never be more horrible than in the early days of history, yet it persisted throughout the ages. Happily there is no reason to believe that if we ever again are forced into a national struggle we will ever return to the frightful carnage which resulted from hand-to-hand combat with battle-ax, spear, and dagger.

As a matter of fact, the chemical weapons developed in the last war and since can be shown conclusively to be the least inhumane. Some 30 per cent of the American casualties were due to gas, but of this number less than 2 per cent died. Of the 70 per cent of casualties which resulted from the use of the older weapons of war some 24 per cent died, showing that the ratio in the American Army of deaths from gas and deaths from weapons other than gas is about 1 to 12. The British statistics bear out this comparison. For full explanation of this subject, and of the foolish statements that gas causes tuberculosis, blindness, etc., I am inclosing a study of the subject made by me entitled "World War Casualties From Gas and Other Weapons."

From a military viewpoint there is nothing to be gained and much to be lost by seeking horrible weapons. War is a method of imposing the national will on an enemy. Wars are tremendously expensive; and if, as a result of them, the enemy is so weakened as to be unable to pay the bill, the winner loses along with the vanquished. Therefore the least destruction of material or personnel resources possible is the most desirable from all viewpoints.

In modern chemistry and aeronautics lie effective means for such warfare, although I do not believe that the airplane will drive armies from the field or navies from the ocean. That nation which leads in scientific developments, however, can make war so effectively by these means as to make it impossible to any nation less industrially and scientifically prepared. That, I think, is what Mr. Garvan had in mind when he prepared his letter for the American Chemical Society. In chemistry and the chemical industries we find a plowshare most easily, simply, and economically practicable for conversion into a sword.

I am convinced that America recognizes this fact and should ponder over it and strengthen her hand in this respect. The greedy, unscrupulous nation will not fail to take advantage of modern science. America, with unbounded resources in raw material, in brain power, and in manufacturing ability, must maintain the lead.

I wish to stress a particular point, however; the existence of a powerful chemical industry alone is not sufficient. There must be some nucleus around which to build in an emergency. There must be some agency to coordinate the industrial effort and to mobilize it in the defense of the Nation. Although it is much simpler to change to a war-time basis in the chemical industry than it is to turn an industry manufacturing steel implements into one that manufactures cannon or shell, it is nevertheless a proposition that requires time and organized effort. There must be, moreover, some one agency charged with continuous research in chemical warfare and with the duty of organizing the chemical industries for military effort.

All nations to-day are strengthening their chemical arms and are conducting research continually, looking toward supremacy in chemical warfare. Our Army and Navy would be ineffective if they lacked protection against chemicals of an enemy. Research to maintain chemical defense is an obvious requirement.

Fortunately a very farsighted Congress in 1920 provided a Chemical Warfare Service as a separate branch of our Army, charged with just these things. It is particularly important that this small service should be kept strong, so that in time of war it can coordinate the industrial chemical effort. This spearhead to a powerful and well-organized chemical industry will insure the Nation of real chemical supremacy in war. With both of these we need have no fear in times of national emergency, for we can be quite certain that no one will seek to make war against us. Since we ourselves seek war with no one, we have in our hands the real key to peace.

The cheapness and economic simplicity of such a means of warfare could be made the subject of an entire paper.

I am surprised that any Senator should feel that chemistry had not played a tremendously important part in the World War. The facts are particularly significant. Chemistry, of course, played an enormous part in the production of all war weapons, in the chemistry of steel, the chemistry of powders, and other similar ways. However, as chemical warfare alone it was tremendously effective.

As I have stated above, chemical warfare caused almost a third of all American casualties. This is particularly significant, for at the time America came into the World War Germany's production of war gases was dropping rapidly.

Gas casualties in the French Army are estimated as 190,000; those in the British Army, 180,000; the Russian records are incomplete and many of them have been lost, but it has been recorded that three gas attacks alone on them resulted in over 20,000 casualties. The Germans admit 75,000 gas casualties, and the number was probably considerably greater than this. While the total number of casualties caused by gas is not accurately known, it is conservatively estimated at 600,000.

It will be interesting to see just what agencies caused this tremendous number. The maximum number of gas troops engaged in actual service at any one time by the principal nations engaged in the last war was approximately 17,000. In addition to the special gas troops, the artillery was the only other agency using gas, except for some few gas grenades used by the infantry, which can be disregarded.

The total number of gas shell manufactured and used by the principal nations was approximately 58,000,000. This figure seems to be somewhere between 5 and 10 per cent of the total artillery shell used by these nations. It is, therefore, essentially correct to state that all gas casualties were caused by 17,000 gas troops and the artillery gas shell mentioned above. Thus 17,000 gas troops and between 5 and 10 per cent of the total artillery shell used caused well over one-half million of the casualties in the armies engaged. Certainly this illustrates very powerfully the effectiveness of chemical warfare. The figures given are most conservative, for some writers have estimated that the Russians alone suffered in the neighborhood of one-half million gas casualties.

In interpreting this data it should be borne in mind that the 17,000 gas troops did not serve for the duration of the war, the number being increased to the maximum mentioned as the war progresses. Furthermore, the power of the real chemical offense is shown when it is realized that certain of the chemical agent used were very ineffective. For example, the German blue-cross shell, of which 14,000,000 were manufactured, were almost a total failure as regards their gas content, although they did have a heavy charge of high explosive which had effect.

The tear-gas type of shell, of which many were used, produced practically no casualties, although it served a purpose in disorganizing, and the French Vincennite shell, amounting to a very large percentage of the French gas shell, were only slightly effective. As a matter of fact, the mustard-gas shell was the only highly effective gas shell used. Ten million were manufactured and these produced about 350,000 casualties. During the major battles at the end of the war the German supply of mustard gas gave out or the casualties produced would have been much greater.

No one can understand these facts without admitting the efficiency of gas as a weapon of warfare, and these figures represent only what actually happened during the World War. With the improved methods that have been developed since 1918 among the armies of the world, with the increased knowledge which has eliminated some of the less effective agents, with improved means for disseminating gases, Mr. Garvan is correct when he believes that the Nation supreme in chemical warfare can make it impossible for a weaker nation to engage with it.

In addition to the use of casualty-producing agents, chemical warfare has introduced into the art of war an entirely new factor with the use of smoke. The development of smoke promises to influence tactics to a very great degree. Already means have been devised whereby a fast-flying airplane can lay a curtain of smoke over wide areas entirely blotting out visibility of those within the cloud. Smoke laid down on rifleman cuts down their firing efficiency to one-twelfth of what it is when they have clear vision.

Various means have been devised by chemical warfare experts to employ smoke for the purpose of blinding the enemy or concealing operations of friendly troops. Similarly at sea smoke screens are of value to the Navy.

The entire question of chemical warfare must be faced. It can not be ignored. Effectiveness, the real criterion by which a weapon is judged, makes it certain that its use will never be abandoned until something more effective is developed by science.

A reading of the statistics of the last war demonstrates conclusively the cheapness and economic simplicity of the use of chemicals. Although less than 1 per cent of the \$14,000,000,000 spent by the various branches of the national defense for making war weapons was spent on chemical warfare, about 30 per cent of the casualties were produced by that cheap weapon. On the other hand, 28 per cent of the funds were spent on the older type of weapons, which were responsible for the remaining 70 per cent of casualties. This is assuming that the German casualties were proportionate to ours, which is about the case.

America has it in her power to lead the world in chemical preparedness. Neglect to take advantage of this opportunity will result in a tremendous handicap when the next emergency arises—a handicap which may prove fatal to national security.

Nothing in the above discussion indicates that chemical warfare and aeronautics can replace any or all of the other usual means of making war. These two arms are simply a part of the general machine which should be allocated in proper proportions in any scheme of national defense.

Sincerely yours,

H. L. GILCHRIST,

Major General, Chief of Chemical Warfare Service.

FUNERAL OF THE LATE SECRETARY OF WAR, HON. JAMES W. GOOD

The VICE PRESIDENT, under the provisions of Senate Resolution 159, appointed as the committee of the Senate to join a committee of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the late Secretary of War, Hon. James W. Good, on behalf of Congress, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DALE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. STECK], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART].

ENFORCEMENT OF PROHIBITION (S. DOC. NO. 38)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 153, a memorandum of November 15, 1929, from the Commissioner of Prohibition furnishing information called for by the resolution in connection with the additional amount for the enforcement of the prohibition act appropriated by the first deficiency appropriation act approved March 4, 1929; also a memorandum of November 15, 1929, from the Commissioner of Customs with attached statements showing the use made of the appropriation of \$707,860 contained in the second deficiency appropriation act approved March 4, 1929, the purpose of the appropriation being for the prevention of smuggling, including intoxicating beverages, etc., which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PETITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the National Patriotic Association at Chicago, Ill., favoring a prompt and thorough investigation of the activities and source of funds of the National Council for the Prevention of War, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Parent-Teacher Association of the Willie P. Mangun High School, of Bahama, N. C., favoring the admission of the United States to the World Court, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of the French Chamber of Commerce of New York, N. Y., praying for a reconsideration of the language of the proposed section 526 of the pending tariff bill, H. R. 2667, affecting imported articles bearing United States trade-marks, to the end that it may be so amended as to avoid the "impairment of the trade between France and the United States and result in great injury to American interests which have acquired distribution and trademark rights to French products and devoted years to building up an international trade in such commodities," which was ordered to lie on the table.

EXPENDITURE FOR THE SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate Resolution 157, submitted by Mr. Moses on the 12th instant, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules hereby is authorized to expend from the appropriation for miscellaneous items, contingent fund of the Senate, fiscal year 1928, \$15,000 for maintenance, miscellaneous items, supplies, equipment, and labor for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building.

COMPENSATION OF MESSENGER TO SENATOR SCHALL

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate Resolution 158, submitted by Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana on the 14th instant, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the compensation of the messenger acting as personal attendant to Hon. THOMAS D. SCHALL, appointed under authority of Senate Resolution 243, Seventieth Congress, first session, be hereafter paid at the rate of \$150 per month.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FESS:

A bill (S. 2149) for the relief of Charles A. Evans (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 2150) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. D. Buzzell (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2151) granting a pension to Cora L. Dunn (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana:

A bill (S. 2152) granting a pension to Evelyn M. Beaumont (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 2153) granting a pension to Frank Gates (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 2154) to amend section 366 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 2155) for the relief of Clara Brunelle; and

A bill (S. 2156) for the relief of Clarence J. Burris; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2157) granting an increase of pension to Cora L. Buckley;

A bill (S. 2158) granting a pension to Mary Ellen Clark; and

A bill (S. 2159) granting an increase of pension to Horace M. Patton; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2160) for the relief of Mrs. L. E. Burton;

A bill (S. 2161) for the relief of Homer Harrington;

A bill (S. 2162) for the relief of Walter Haepfer;

A bill (S. 2163) for the relief of J. C. Glover; and

A bill (S. 2164) for the relief of La Roy Young; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 2165) for the relief of James T. Moore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 2166) for the relief of Richard Riggles; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2167) to authorize United States district judges to provide for the trial by United States commissioners of certain classes of cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE:

A bill (S. 2168) granting an increase of pension to Elvira A. Dodge (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2169) granting an increase of pension to Fara A. Chase (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2170) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Coburn (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF BILL

Mr. COUZENS, Mr. RANDELL, and Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to House bill 2667, the tariff revision bill, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PAY OF SENATE PAGES

Mr. JONES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 160), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay out of the appropriation for miscellaneous items, contingent fund of the Senate, fiscal year 1930, to the pages for the Senate Chamber at the rate of \$4 per diem, from the day following the date of adjournment of the present session of Congress until the 30th day of November, 1929, both dates inclusive.

INVESTIGATION OF THE NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE

Mr. HEFLIN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 161), which was ordered to lie on the table:

Whereas on yesterday the papers carried a statement by Ralph B. Wilson, president of the Babson Statistical Organization, in which he said, "At the peak of the bull market the yield on many issues had been cut to as little as 1 per cent, while the prices of the stocks soared to thirty or forty times their earning power." In addition to this flouting the multiplication table, Mr. Wilson said, "a disregard of the commandment against lying had much to do with the stock market boom and subsequent collapse"; and

Whereas on yesterday, at Rochester, N. Y., Roger W. Babson decried investments through declaring that they "operated as blind pools and are especially dangerous. This situation will not be finally closed

until investment trusts and finance companies are compelled to make public statements of their holdings, and have their accounts examined as are the accounts of national banks." Mr. Babson further said, "during the last two years the stock market has been enjoying a boom the same as the Florida boom. The same crowd ran both parties." It appears that the banks and the investment trusts and especially the Government banks have joined these booming parties and have been aiding and abetting in the crime of 1929, and, no doubt, they have their paid agents and lobbyists holding like a "setter pup" with their eagle eye on Congress; and

Whereas in order to meet the issue and to meet face to face in their own den the bulls and bears who devour an innocent and trusting public: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Lobby Investigating Committee be instructed and empowered to make an examination of the books and accounts, and of the methods of procedure of the New York Stock Exchange, and report the sales, by whom made or sold, and especially the purchases and sales made since the bull market was broken, giving kind, date, and amount of sales, as well as the names of all dummies that have been used in settling the transactions; and also to report all investment trusts and their operations who have been dealing directly or indirectly with or through said stock exchange; and to report such remedial legislation as, in their judgment, is necessary to correct evils herein spoken of, to forever prevent the recurrence of same and put under governmental observance or control this group of stock-exchange houses.

COTTON-MILL WAGES IN THE SOUTH

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Anniston Star, of Anniston, Ala., entitled "Cotton-Mill Wages in the South Are Presented in a New Aspect."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Anniston (Ala.) Star, November 17, 1929]

COTTON-MILL WAGES IN THE SOUTH ARE PRESENTED IN A NEW ASPECT

There is reproduced on this page to-day an interesting editorial from the Talladega Daily Home that presents the question of cotton-mill wages, which are so prominently in the limelight to-day, as a result of the North Carolina strikes, in a relative aspect. The Home makes the point that before mill pay is raised something should be done about the wages of farm workers; for, it says, the average wage paid the tiller of the soil in the South is \$1.45 per day in contrast with \$3.57 in the North.

The Daily Home does well to justify smaller wages in the South for mill workers and industrial employees generally in a light of our more beneficent climate. Attention was called to this Southern advantage some time ago by the publisher of the Anniston Star in a radio address over WAPI, in which he quoted Guy Morrison Walker, an eminent Northern economist, who said:

"The difference in the cost of living between what the Northern worker must spend for food, warm clothes, and heating his house and what the same worker would have to spend keeping warm in the South is not less than \$200 or \$250 a year. If a Southern worker accepts a wage of 25 per cent less than a worker in the same class gets in the North, he is still about 15 per cent better paid in proportion to his cost of living. This low cost of labor is a most important item to consider when one comes to develop the resources of the South."

The Anniston Star is not an advocate of low wages. On the other hand, we believe with Henry Ford that industry as a whole is the better off by reason of the high wage scale that prevails in this country. We believe furthermore that labor should share in the savings effected by modern machinery. But the facts cited by our Talladega contemporary and by Mr. Walker are incontrovertible and must be taken into consideration by representatives of the mill employees before they undertake to disturb the amicable relations now existing between employee and employer in the textile industry in the South as a whole. Certainly the present is no time to force men out of work.

MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article appearing in the Florence (Ala.) Times-News of November 14, 1929, entitled "Nitrate Plant Idleness Costs Farmers \$50,461,530." It also contains an itemized statement, month by month, of the power possibilities at Muscle Shoals, together with a statement of the waste of the power because it was not bought by the power company under the contract.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NITRATE PLANT IDLENESS COSTS FARMERS \$50,461,530

In the 12 months ending October 30, the Alabama Power Co. purchased 173,152,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity from the Govern-

ment at Wilson Dam, or 10% per cent of the 1,628,197,550 kilowatt-hours available, leaving a waste of approximately 90 per cent or 1,455,045,550 kilowatt-hours.

On the power wasted, a value of approximately \$3,060,000 must be placed, on the basis of the average rate per kilowatt-hour paid for power (2.115 mills per kilowatt-hour) at the beginning of the period covered.

But the amount lost to the farmers of the Nation was much greater than the \$3,000,000 lost to the National Treasury, for converted into nitrates, the total power available would have manufactured 360,439,500 pounds of nitrate.

Chilean nitrate costs the farmer 20 cents per pound, but Muscle Shoals nitrates can be profitably sold at 6 cents. Thus for every pound of fertilizer that can be, but is not, made at Muscle Shoals, the farmer loses 14 cents.

During the year ending with October, the manufacture of nitrates at Muscle Shoals would have saved the farmer 14 cents per pound on 360,439,500 pounds or \$50,461,430.

Figures on power sold and power available were furnished by the Government.

Wilson Dam power statistics from November 1, 1928, to October 30, 1929, inclusive

Month	Power sold	Power available	Estimated waste	Per cent sold
1928				
November	7,445,000	129,445,200	122,000,200	5%
December	14,966,000	139,501,900	124,535,900	10%
1929				
January	20,535,000	144,198,400	123,663,400	14%
February	2,835,000	140,859,200	138,024,200	2%
March	3,081,000	130,175,400	127,094,400	2%
April	3,046,000	150,652,100	147,606,100	2%
May	3,067,000	144,902,500	141,835,500	2%
June	3,044,000	152,245,500	149,201,500	2%
July	5,075,000	160,357,900	145,282,900	3%
August	38,440,000	100,593,900	62,153,900	37%
September	40,110,000	109,296,650	69,186,650	36%
October	31,508,000	135,668,900	104,160,900	23%
Total	173,152,000	1,628,197,550	1,455,045,550	10%

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ROYAL S. COPELAND

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address delivered by my colleague [Mr. COPELAND] before the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers, in New York City, November 15, 1929.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What our country is to be in the family of nations depends on its merchant fleet. We may have treasures of gold in the banks, but unless we can dispose of our surplus goods and crops to advantage our riches will disappear.

The great powers, the world powers, are the nations that control the export trade. In the last analysis it is the merchant fleet and not the vessels of war that fix national supremacy.

If Britain were to destroy half her warships to-morrow, she would still be "mistress of the seas." Her merchant ships, with all their potentialities, would guarantee her ocean supremacy.

It is not unusual for the Congress of the United States to enact into law a solemn declaration of intention. Having witnessed the steady decline in the percentage of American foreign trade carried in American ships, there was a revival of interest in the importance of an adequate merchant marine. In response to a popular demand Congress enacted the merchant marine act of 1920.

The opening section of this law prescribes the purpose and policy of the United States. Let me quote:

"It is necessary for the national defense and for the proper growth of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine of the best equipped and most suitable types of vessels sufficient to carry the greater portion of its commerce and serve as a naval or military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, ultimately to be owned and operated privately by citizens of the United States."

Section 1 continues:

"And it is declared to be the policy of the United States to do whatever may be necessary to develop and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine, and, in so far as may not be inconsistent with the express provisions of this chapter, the United States Shipping Board shall, in the disposition of vessels and shipping property as hereinafter provided, in the making of rules and regulations, and in the administration of the shipping laws keep always in view this purpose and object as the primary end to be attained."

These are brave words. But we appear to hold to this conviction because the Congress reviewed the whole problem in 1928 and reaffirmed the declaration of policy I have just quoted. The latest law declared

that, "the policy and primary purpose declared in section 1 of the merchant marine act of 1920 is hereby confirmed."

So far as the laws on the statute books are concerned, our country is solemnly committed to a merchant marine of the best equipped and most suitable types of vessels, sufficient to carry the greater portion of its commerce.

It would seem to me that no thinking person who reads the language I have quoted could have any possible doubt of the intention of Congress to remove every possible barrier from the progress of American shipping. Until there is some further declaration by the Congress, every official of Government, as I view it, is committed to the encouragement of the American merchant marine. What must happen if we are to have a successful privately owned American merchant marine?

It is not possible for the United States to compete with foreign bottoms unless some sort of definite financial aid is provided for our ships. Great Britain is wise in her day and generation. She pays about a million dollars a year to merchant seamen enlisted in her naval reserve. She pays hundreds of thousands of dollars in the form of annual retainers to seamen who drill one week every year with the navy. Great Britain pays about a hundred thousand dollars a year to seamen who are known as Royal Naval Volunteers.

But this isn't all. She pays naval subventions to something like 20 fast steamers so built as to be readily converted into auxiliary naval cruisers. These subventions, as I understand it, amount to about half a million dollars every year. Likewise the Cunard Line receives an annual subvention of three-quarters of a million dollars in return for the obligation to sell or lease any of its ships to the Government in case of need.

More than this, the British Government pays liberally for the carriage of the mails. The requirements as to quarters and food for the crew are much less than we require of American shipowners.

All these facts were developed during the debate last year in the Congress. We thought we passed an act that would stimulate American shipping. As a matter of fact, it has stimulated American shipping, but not to the extent to which the law is capable of doing.

After extended debate in the Senate my amendment providing for liberal mail contracts was defeated. But when the bill came back from the House with this provision included, after further debate, it was accepted by the Senate.

The law of 1928 provides for a classification of vessels and corresponding rates of compensation. It is unfortunate that the bill being modeled on the law of March 3, 1891, retained this language: "Said contracts shall be made with the lowest responsible bidder."

I say it is unfortunate because there is no doubt that those of us who were urging the passage of the merchant marine act of 1928 believed we were providing for the award of mail contracts to established American services. We believed, and still believe, that the surest way and the safest way to secure an American merchant marine is by building up the established lines. In my opinion, the granting of mail contracts to American steamships should be on the basis of the 1928 act, and not on the foreign mail service act of March, 1891.

I recognize the embarrassment of the Postmaster General in attempting to reconcile the two statutes. But if the intent of the Congress has any virtue whatever in making final determination in a matter of this sort, it is clear to me that these ocean mail contracts must be given to lines which the Government has instituted and made possible by the sale to it of its merchant ships.

We have a number of ships and lines still unsold. How can we hope to find purchasers for these vessels unless we carry out in good faith the intent of the merchant marine act of 1928?

I was opposed to the sale of the United States Line and the American Merchant Line to one bidder. I felt it was a mistake to put all of our eggs in one basket, so to speak. However, my view did not prevail. The ships were sold to the Chapman Co., and as I view it, it is now the duty of our Government to assist these owners in the successful operation of the great ships they purchased from the United States.

Frankly, I do not believe we are keeping faith with the purchasers unless the mail contracts which naturally belong to these ships shall be awarded to the United States Lines. There are other lines, too, which were purchased from the Government which should be given the most generous possible mail aid.

One of the arguments used in the debate in 1928 was based on a letter I received from the Postmaster General. In this he pointed out that in the preceding year the cost of sea transportation for the trans-Atlantic mails from American to European ports was three and a half million dollars, of which nearly one and a half million was paid to vessels of foreign registry, mostly British.

We make a fight for liberal mail contracts and liberal mail rates in order that American citizens might be encouraged to purchase Government ships, and in replacements and additions, to invest their money in the building of the very best ships that float.

We provided for much more liberal loans than ever before. A large sum of money was devoted to this purpose to be given to American citizens at a low rate of interest to encourage the building of ships.

I am glad to say that this feature of the law has brought results. The Shipping Board has actually loaned \$19,000,000. In addition, loans

have been authorized to the extent of more than \$45,000,000, making a grand total of \$64,000,000.

But alas! While the plans and specifications for the proposed ships have been approved, in several instances final consideration has been postponed at the request of the companies because of the unexpected uncertainty of mail contracts.

If the Congress meant what it said in the preamble to the act of 1920, and which it reaffirmed in the merchant marine act of 1928, and if it meant that ocean mail contracts were to be impartially awarded to ships on essential routes to the end that an American owned and operated merchant marine might be established and maintained, it is high time that Government officials charged with the administration of this law take action and carry out the purpose of Congress. Congress indicated clearly where this duty lay and never intended its execution to be undertaken by a body such as the interdepartmental committee appointed by the President.

The duty rests with the Postmaster General to certify the mail routes and with the Shipping Board to designate the size, type, and speed of the vessels to ply thereon.

As I see it, our Government has not lived up to its implied promise to award ocean mail contracts and the request of the United States Lines and others has met with uncalled-for delay.

While we are delaying the help that will make our merchant marine a factor in world trade, our foreign competitors are building faster and better ships. We shall drop behind in the race if the Government does not keep faith with our shipping interests.

We must not be discouraged if we do not get at once all the aid a worthy cause should command. I am confident that the organization represented here to-night is capable of assisting materially in the education of the American public to the importance of an adequate merchant marine. With widened knowledge will come more enthusiastic support of the efforts we are making in Congress to provide our country with ships and shipping of which we need not be ashamed.

REVISION OF THE TARIFF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes, the pending question being on the amendment of the Committee on Finance, on page 152, line 21, after the word "dyed," to strike out "or colored" and insert "colored, or woven-figured."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the raid on the pocketbooks of the American housewife which is now being perpetrated here in the guise of tariff protection for agriculture may have results, as has been pointed out in the debate, little foreseen by the advocates of these extortionate rates on foodstuffs. In some cases the greed which dictates these further boosts may operate to kill the goose which lays the golden eggs.

One striking illustration is the case of butter. I have on my desk an editorial published in the Boston Post last Saturday, November 16, which predicts that New England housewives will turn from butter to oleomargarine, that highly valuable and much abused food product, rather than to pay still higher prices for butter which will come if this bill in its present form becomes law.

"High-priced butter means that most housewives must get along without it. Oleomargarine will gradually supplant it," says the editorial writer.

The editorial contains much food for thought. It is significant of the state of mind of the great body of consumers in the Eastern States. I ask that the editorial be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

[From Boston Post, November 16, 1929]

DOING WITHOUT BUTTER

If the tariff bill is finally passed with the rates for agricultural products as fixed by the Senate, the housewives of New England might as well prepare for the greatest raid on their pocketbooks in all the history of tariff making.

It was calculated that each family of five in New England will pay about \$3.50 a week more under the new tariff rates on foodstuffs as fixed by the House. In many cases the Senate has raised the House rates, so that \$3.50 a week extra will hardly suffice to meet the increased costs in the Senate bill.

One striking illustration is the duty on butter. This was fixed at the enormous rate of 14 cents a pound in the House bill. An attempt will be made in the Senate to increase this to 20 cents. A 14-cent rate is sheer robbery, but a 20-cent rate will send the price of butter to such heights that the average family can not afford the luxury.

Housewives will be compelled to turn to oleomargarine, that highly valuable but much-abused food product. It is only shrewd propaganda by the butter makers that prevents the real merit of oleomargarine from being recognized. No food product is made under more strictly sanitary conditions. It is every bit as nutritious as butter. No one but an expert can detect the difference between butter and oleomargarine.

Not one family in a hundred in England uses butter. They use oleomargarine and like it. Most English restaurants and hotels serve oleomargarine as butter.

The western butter makers realize the danger that oleomargarine may supplant butter. They are now seeking to bar, as far as possible, the importation of vegetable oils from the Philippines which are essential ingredients of oleomargarine. But at the present time the price of oleomargarine is reasonable.

The food value of this perfect butter substitute has never been recognized in New England. But, for that matter, it is only within recent years that housewives have been willing to buy western butter which was long looked upon as an inferior product and is still inferior to our New England butter.

High-priced butter means that most housewives must get along without it. Oleomargarine will gradually supplant it. Thus the western butter makers will kill the goose that has laid the golden eggs for them for years, for the western dairy farmers are by far the most prosperous of all persons engaged in agriculture in the United States. Butter is certainly not a necessity when oleomargarine answers all purposes.

Tuesday, November 19, 1929

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, at the close of the session last evening I was about to enter upon an analysis of the increases in the rates on cotton cloth. Before proceeding to that analysis this morning I want again to call attention to and emphasize the proposition that those who are advocating an increase in the rates on cotton cloth utterly fail in making out a case either from the standpoint of labor or from the standpoint of industry.

It is said that the textile industry is greatly depressed. That probably is true. I do not know, however, about the accuracy of such probability. The chances are that if the textile industry would introduce into their operations efficiencies, economies, decency, and humanity, the industry would not be in distress. Because of their failure to undertake the introduction of such elements into their industry they come to the Congress asking for tremendous, excessive, and exorbitant rates upon their products. They are asking Congress to build the tariff wall higher and higher and higher, and what they expect to erect behind that tariff wall is a combination of monopolies and merger of various industrial organizations.

As the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] said on yesterday, the competition that exists is between the North and the South. That, to a large extent, is due to labor conditions. However, there has been no earnest effort, there has been no intelligent effort on the part of those who control the textile industry to improve either the conditions of the workingman or themselves. They have been and they are a crowd of grasping corporations and individuals. I have some knowledge of the textile industry in my own State. It is very limited in extent, if indeed, the hosiery business is a part of the textile industry; but, Mr. President, I know from personal observation and official investigation that the men who own the industry are waxing rich; they are not in distress. They still own their palatial homes; they still have their retinue of servants and attendants; they still have their limousines, their trained fox hounds, and riding horses. They enjoy all the ordinary advantages of life and they enjoy all the extravagancies and luxuries of life; but the men and women working in those industries are in distress.

I have not been able to obtain from the report of the Internal Revenue Department information respecting the income-tax returns of individuals and corporations engaged in the textile industry. There may be a few as to which the Internal Revenue Department has reported. I am having an investigation made in the effort to find out if a report has been made as to any branches of the textile industry.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have not the particular information concerning which the Senator from Wisconsin is inquiring, but I call his attention to the fact that in volume 9, Schedule 9, in the hearings upon cotton manufactures, he will find on page 5385 a table prepared by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the year 1926, in which there is reported the total income of corporations throughout the country for that period

of time. That table shows that of the various industries, the percentage of net profits to sales was the lowest for the cotton-textile industry. I call the Senator's attention to that fact, which will be found on page 5385 of this document.

Mr. BLAINE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Of course it does not disclose anything in regard to individual profits.

Mr. BLAINE. But that does not mean anything; it gives no information whatever. The fact that the textile industry had the lowest return does not mean that they are in the throes of bankruptcy—not at all. The fact is that they are making profits; there is not any question about that. Anyone who has observed the owners of cotton-textile industries knows full well that no bread is taken from the mouths of their children; no luxury is denied them; no extravagance is denied them. That is the evidence. I care not what the figures may show as to that industry being the lowest of the income-producing industries. That proves nothing; it means nothing. One can ascertain the condition of the owners of the industry by observing the position they occupy in American life, surrounded, as they are, by all the luxury and all the gilt and gold of extravagance. Does that mean depression?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I want to say frankly to the Senator that there are certain branches of the textile industry which, in my judgment, are very prosperous and have not suffered greatly from the general depression in that industry. I frankly concede that we could find in various parts of the country textile industries, producing particular textile products, that would prove to be most prosperous; but there are other branches of the industry where the contrary situation exists.

Mr. BLAINE. As the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] would say, those industries ought to introduce better methods; let them find efficient means of operating; but I contend that those who are demanding excessive and exorbitant tariff increases ought to make out a case, and mere generalities are not sufficient to support the increased tariff duties which are sought. There is not a single word of specification, there is not any evidence that would be accepted by a jury or a judge, that a single one of the component parts of this industry is depressed. The fact is quite the contrary, and when I say "the fact is quite the contrary," if one will go to the homes of the owners of the industry there he will find the evidence of their prosperity.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I can take the Senator to various parts of the country and show him closed cotton mills; I can show him cotton mills that have been running on half time for years; I can show him the evidence of the bankruptcy of various branches of the cotton-textile industry. Let me say to the Senator that when the cotton-textile schedule was before the Senate in 1922, because of the prosperous condition of the industry I voted against practically every attempt to raise the rates; I intend to vote against the attempt to increase rates as to several branches of the industry which are to be considered when we take up other paragraphs of the schedule; but I am convinced that there has been a very serious depression in certain branches of the industry. I do not admit that the tariff protection is going to bring those branches of the industry back to life and bring prosperity back to them, but in some particulars increased tariff protection will be a contributing aid to the restoration of some prosperity in certain branches of the industry.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, for every textile industry that is closed, for every textile industry that has gone into bankruptcy, the cause will be found in overproduction. There is no tariff duty that is going to relieve that condition in an industry.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I frankly concede that that has been a large contributing factor to the condition.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I merely wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that, of course, there are closed factories in New England—nobody disputes that; but the fact of the matter is that in the South the mill owners have been working their mills on day shifts and night shifts, and that in many of the factories they have been working women at night, and they have been working children at night.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. Undoubtedly the cotton industry in the South, speaking broadly, has been exceedingly prosperous; there is no question about that. The statement, however, that the cotton mills of the South are running day and night shifts is true only as to a limited number of mills. The great majority of them, I think, do not do that. The great majority of them, I think, conform strictly to the laws of the State regulating child labor, and the abuses in that respect are not as represented.

Mr. President, with reference to the wages paid in the South, they are not as high as those paid in New England, in dollars and cents; but living conditions in the South are so much cheaper than they are in New England—and necessarily so, because of the greater development of the New England States than of the Southern States, and the higher prices of commodities generally in that section of the country—that, taking these things into consideration, the wages paid in the South are substantially as remunerative as are those paid in the North.

The southern mills are confined in their operations, very largely, to the manufacture of what is known as the coarser or cheaper cotton goods. They are beginning to make a few of the finer goods, and that branch of the industry is increasing to some extent in the South. Up to this time, however, their operations have been chiefly confined to the manufacture of the coarser goods, and there is no particular competition in those with foreign producers. The imports are negligible as to that class of goods.

In the New England section of the country, however, where they make the finer class of cotton fabrics the cotton mills are brought in pretty sharp competition with the mills of Europe, especially those of Great Britain, and probably of Germany, and the imports are very large, there being, I think, about sixty-odd million dollars' worth of imports a year, or something like that.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. In certain grades of cloth produced by certain branches of the industry the importations are very large.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; my information is, Mr. President, and I think it is general information, that, while there are certain mills in New England that are very prosperous, just as in the South, there are certain mills, making certain lines of goods as to which the competition is more acute than in other lines, which are not prosperous—I think the general understanding in the trade is that those lines are very unprosperous in New England. There is a differentiation between the conditions existing in the South and those existing in New England. I do not think the cotton mill people of the South are asking for any particular increase in duties. It has not come to my attention if they are.

I wished to make this statement merely in explanation of conditions that are known generally in my State by the cotton mill people.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I have a volume containing a series of industrial studies which are being made by the Labor Research Association, which is an organization devoted to the gathering and interpretation of economic material for the labor movement. In that volume the southern textile situation is discussed, and I shall read a few paragraphs from it:

Most of the 300,000 unorganized textile workers in the South are in cotton mills. But as the southern mills gradually increase the output of their fine goods with silk mixtures they are coming into competition with a section of the northern silk industry. Some 26,000 southern textile workers are in the huge new rayon plants, feudal in their management and remote from other industries.

And to a large extent the owners of those textile mills are nonresidents of that community. They are the landlords of foreign parts, foreign to that community.

Some 40,000 are in the knitting mills, including plants turning out full-fashioned silk and rayon hosiery. A few thousand workers—exact figures were not given in the 1925 census of manufactures—are scattered through mills classified as silk mills in Virginia and other Southern States. Only in the Piedmont district has unionism begun to take hold among southern textile workers.

Unorganized southern mill workers have been in the past opposed to unionism. Families of old American stock—

These 100 per cent purebred Anglo-Saxons who have never been touched by the influence of these so-called "damned foreigners"—an expression which we often hear from those who would bar from this country an essential stock, necessary for the perpetuity of a strong, virile, and vigorous American citizenship—

Families of old American stock, coming down from rough cabins in the hills, thought at first that the mill village was a paradise. A little cash in hand from working in the mills seemed like wealth in comparison with bare existence in the mountains. They found the whole com-

munity around them opposed to a labor union and its principles as a "foreign institution."

But the second generation of textile workers is beginning to wake up. They are realizing that the whole family has to work in the mills in order to live in the company houses and make a meager living. They hear now about better conditions in other States and in other southern industries. * * * The mill village will lose its hold on the children as they grow up.

This is what unionism, or the hope for unionism, says:

Unless unions begin at once on a far-reaching, large-scale campaign to organize southern textile workers we shall find the new industrial South more and more powerfully antiunion. The textile industry in the South is for the most part large-scale industry.

Mr. President, that means mass production. That means that the machine is doing the work. The labor is a mere automaton attending a machine.

The textile industry in the South is for the most part large-scale industry. Big northern companies with southern branches compete with big southern companies.

The textile industry in competition with itself as between the northern industries and the southern industries.

Mergers are as much the tendency in the South as in the North.

To forestall the antiunion policy of big cotton and rayon companies—

This is the advice of organized workers—

a union should go for the "big fellows."

That means organize those large industries.

The only force that can oppose the financial power of large-scale industry and of the great banks behind it is working-class solidarity. In this rapidly expanding southern industry new conditions are bringing in new ideas. There is far less unemployment—

Speaking of the South—

than in the northern textile centers. All is on the upgrade.

They proclaim that—

Now is the time to organize southern textile workers.

That outlines in a way the cause for the difference in the wage scale in the southern mills and the northern mills; but I am contending here that there is no evidence before the Senate—no evidence that would be accepted by a court or jury if they were to pass upon the questions of fact before us—to support a single increase in the duty on these textiles. The difficulty with the textile industries comes from another source. Therefore, Mr. President, I am opposed to building this tariff wall higher and higher under the pretense that the increased rates are going to help labor. I am opposed to building this wall higher and higher on the pretense that these textile industries are depressed because of lack of tariff. In neither case is there justification for increased tariff; but if you build this wall higher you are simply providing for the future an industrial system, both in the North and the South, that will not only weigh heavily upon the working men and women in those mills but as well upon the consumers in the United States.

Now, let me examine this question a little further.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not going to enter into any discussion about the rates. I do not mean to refer to those at all; but the Senator said a little while ago that the tendency in the South is toward mergers. If that is true, I have not observed it nor heard of it. There are some very wealthy families in the South that have a number of mills rather closely owned, I think, in their families; but I am not aware of any movement in the South in the direction of merging the cotton mills. I have not heard of it. It may be that it is going on and I know nothing about it. Personally, I do not think it is going on.

Mr. BLAINE. The Labor Research Association have so reported. I was reading from their report, and not from any information that I have.

Mr. SIMMONS. It has not come to my knowledge. I do know, however, that there are certain wealthy families that have erected a great many mills. For instance, take the Cannon family in my State. They are a very wealthy family. They have probably half a dozen or perhaps six or eight mills located at different points in the State, possibly some outside of the State; but what I understand the Senator to mean by "mergers" is independently owned mills coming together and operating under a general corporation, one corporation, a controlling company. I do not think that has happened to any considerable extent in the South, especially in North Carolina.

We are introducing in North Carolina all kinds of improved machinery, and, of course, we are doing a great deal of the work through machinery in the cotton-mill industry; but is not that true in every industry? Is not improved machinery being introduced throughout this country and throughout the world, and is not a larger part of the work done by machinery everywhere than was formerly done?

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I see no difference between a merger through independent companies consolidating and a merger through the common ownership of stock of various industries in the same family. The effect is identically the same. There is common ownership, there is common direction, there is common administration; and, in my opinion, that is a more dangerous system than the actual open merger of companies, because when families or groups of families become the owners of individual mills or the owners of the stock of those individual mills, which in effect produces a merger, it is like setting up a feudal system—identically the same. Those families become the lords of the community. They exercise a paternalism, a benevolent system which is no different than feudalism; and the worker thereby is reduced to the very dregs of desperation and misery.

That is the result. That may be what is going on in this country and these great industries. I do not know. I am not going to attempt to be a prophet in this matter. But, turning to the question of the foreign-textile industries just for a moment, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] said that there were only a few articles upon which there should be an increased tariff. Those articles that are manufactured abroad, Mr. President, are not manufactured under the mass-production system at all. Those particular items are manufactured by skilled workmen in the English mills and in the French mills. Those workmen have followed that trade through years and years, generation after generation, and they have become artisans—not mere machines to pull a lever, to throw on a switch, to sit and hold a ribbon or to receive a ribbon as it comes from the machines. They are artisans, skilled artisans, intelligent artisans. They have a skill and an art quite analogous to that of the painter and the sculptor, though in a different line.

Those are the men in Great Britain and in France who are making primarily—not altogether, but principally—the very articles to which the Senator from Massachusetts has referred as coming into competition with American industry.

So, Mr. President, I think those who are claiming an increase in the tariff on these cotton fabrics ought to make a clear case, and not rest upon mere generalities. There was a propaganda started a few months ago, prior to the presidential election, that certain industries were depressed, certain industries were lagging, general statements; and those who were seeking these special tariff privileges at once seized upon that propaganda. There is no justification whatever for such claim, and I do not believe that there is a single Member who can show any evidence that would be admitted as material evidence before a court if the case were one under the jurisdiction of such a tribunal.

Now, let us analyze this particular schedule, paragraphs 903 and 904. They go together. They are practically companions. We can not discuss one without discussing both of them.

I have the Tariff Commission's document, Senate Document No. 30; and turning to page 80, there will be found figures as to paragraph 904, countable cotton cloth, unbleached, ranging from average yarn No. 2 to No. 28, inclusive. The House made reductions in four items on that page, and increases in 20 items. There are just 33 items on the page. When I speak of decreases or increases I refer to changes in the rates in the act of 1922. There were 4 decreases and 29 increases. The Senate Finance Committee, in reference to the same 33 items, suggested increases in every one of the 33 items.

On page 81, continuing the same countable cotton cloth, average yarn Nos. 29 to 78, inclusive, the House decreased the tariff on 13 items. It increased the rates on 81 items. That is, out of 94 items on that page, there was a decrease by the House in only 13 items, and an increase in 81 items. The Senate Finance Committee reported a bill which increases the tariff rates on every one of those items—94 increases.

On page 82, continuing the same countable cotton cloth, unbleached, average yarn Nos. 79 to 156, both inclusive, there are 80 items. The House did not make a single decrease. It increased the tariff on every one of the 80 items. The Senate Finance Committee did likewise.

On the same page there are 10 items under "bleached cotton cloth," from average yarn No. 1 to No. 10, both inclusive. The House increased the rate on every one of those items, and the Finance Committee did likewise.

On page 83 there are 93 items, the same cloth, cotton cloth, bleached, average yarn Nos. 11 to 89, both inclusive. The House increased the rate on 81 of those items, and reduced the rate

on only 12. The Finance Committee did exactly the same. It accepted the House rates proposed.

On page 84, the same cloth, average yarn numbers 90 to 194, both inclusive, there are 66 items. The House increased the rates on 58 of those items, and decreased the rates on 8. The Finance Committee accepted the House rates.

On the same page, under another classification, "Printed, dyed, colored, or woven-figured" cotton cloth, with the average yarn numbers 1 to 20, both inclusive, there are 23 items. The House increased the rates on 20 of those items, and reduced the rates on only 3. The Finance Committee increased the rate on every one of those items, on all the 23 items.

On page 85 there are 92 items of the countable cotton cloth, "Printed, dyed, colored, or woven-figured," average yarn numbers 21 to 79, both inclusive. The House increased the rates on 67 items, and decreased the rates on 25 of those items. The Senate Finance Committee increased the rates on 77 of the 92 items, and decreased the rates on 15 of those items.

On page 86, under the same classification, average yarn numbers 80 to 310, both inclusive, there are 59 items. The House increased the rates on 58 of those items, and reduced the rate on only 1. The Senate Finance Committee went the House just one better; it increased the rates on all of the 59 items.

On the same page, under a new classification, "Cotton cloths colored with vat dyes," there are 29 items. The House made reductions in all of the 29 items. The Senate Finance Committee increased the rates on 28 of those items, and reduced the rate on only 1.

On page 87, the same classification continued, with average yarn numbers 37 to 240, both inclusive, there are 71 items. The House increased the rates on 29 of those items, and reduced the rates on 42 of the items. The Senate Finance Committee increased the rates on all of the 71 items.

On the same page, "Cotton cloth woven with eight or more harnesses, or with the Jacquard, lappet, or swivel attachments," there are 17 items. The House increased the rate on every one of those items, and reduced it on none. The Senate Finance Committee likewise functioned; it increased the rate on every one of the 17 items.

On page 88 there are 89 items. The House increased the rate on all of those 89 items, reduced the rate on none, and the Finance Committee did likewise.

On page 89, "Cotton cloth woven with eight or more harnesses, or with Jacquard, lappet, or swivel attachments," yarn numbers 114 to 170, there are 7 items. The House and the Finance Committee increased the rate on each of those 7 items. On the same page, under "Jacquard woven colored with vat dyes," there are 66 items. The House increased the rates on 24 of those items and decreased the rates on 4. The Senate Finance Committee increased the rate on every one of the 66 items.

On the same page, the same cloth, "woven with drop boxes," average yarn numbers 3 to 16, both inclusive, there are 10 items. The House increased the rates on all of those items, and the Senate Finance Committee did likewise.

On page 90, the same classification, "woven with drop boxes," average yarn numbers 17 to 120, both inclusive, there are 77 items. The House increased the rates on all of those items except one. There were 76 increases and 1 decrease. The Finance Committee increased the rate on every one of the 77 items.

On the same page, another classification, "woven with drop boxes, 40 per cent vat dyes," there are 13 items. The House made no increases. It decreased the rates on the 13 items. The Senate Finance Committee reversed the House action and increased the rates on 13 items.

On page 91, following the same classification, average yarn numbers 27 to 120, there are 24 items. The House increased the rates on 7 and decreased the rates on 17. The Senate Finance Committee increased the rates on the 24 items and decreased the rate on none.

Mr. President, I have now given a detailed classification and statement of the increases and decreases in this schedule.

I now want to call attention to the summary found on page 18. Under the first classification, "countable cotton cloth unbleached," the actual or computed ad valorem rate in the present law is 27.90 per cent. The House increased that to 34.35 per cent, and the Senate Finance Committee increased that rate to 35.58 per cent.

On the bleached cotton cloth the ad valorem rate in the present law is 31.12 per cent. The House increased that to 39.73 per cent, and the Finance Committee made the same increase, leaving the Finance Committee's recommendation 39.73 per cent, or an increase of 8.61 per cent, and there was about the same increase in the other item to which I first referred.

Then, on bleached, dyed, colored, or woven-figured, in the present law the computed ad valorem rate is 26.99 per cent, the

House bill provides for 29.82 per cent, and the Senate Finance Committee 33.82 per cent. There is an increase of about 7 per cent.

The next item is "colored with vat dyes." The 1922 rate is 36.20 per cent, the House rate 35.93 per cent. There is a slight decrease made by the House. The decrease, however, is only 0.27 per cent, or about one quarter of 1 per cent. The Senate Committee, however, increased that rate to 39.93 per cent, an increase of about 3.73 points over the present rate.

The next item is "woven with eight or more harnesses or with Jacquard, lappet, or swivel attachments." The present law is 41.28 per cent, the House rate is 46.26 per cent, and the Finance Committee rate is 50.25 per cent, an increase of almost 10 per cent.

The next item is "Jacquard-woven, colored with vat dyes." The present rate is 43.57 per cent, the House rate is 44.60 per cent, and the Finance Committee rate is 48.69 per cent.

The next item is "woven with drop boxes." The present rate is 36.83 per cent, the House rate 40.23 per cent, and the Finance Committee rate is 44.23 per cent, an increase of almost eight points.

The next item is "woven with drop boxes and colored with vat dyes." The present rate is 34.97 per cent. The House reduced that slightly to 34.46 per cent, or 0.51 of 1 per cent. The Senate Finance Committee, however, increased the rate to 38.46 per cent, an increase of about 3½ per cent.

Mr. President, the increases are tremendous. They run all the way from 3 to 10 per cent. I want to give a summary of the details which I have taken from the Tariff Commission's report. The House bill increased the tariff on 630 items of cotton cloth—630 items! It decreased the rate on only 117 items. The Senate Finance Committee increased the rates over the 1922 law on 715 items and decreased the rate on only 45 items.

Mr. President, the documentary evidence is here that these increases have been made on practically every piece of cotton cloth that is manufactured. That means the cloth that is used in the household for any and every purpose and, to a very large extent, used for commercial purposes. The increases will enter materially into the cost of living and will mean an increase in the cost of living. If the textile industries succeed in doing exactly as they apparently will do and are doing—building their mergers, building their monopolies back of this high tariff wall, this wall of privilege—the burdens will be placed upon every consumer and primarily upon the backs of those who must use cotton cloth.

Mr. President, I hope that we can at least defeat the increases proposed by the Finance Committee upon the merits. I am willing, if those who are especially interested in the textile industry are willing to do so, to accept an increased rate on those items where it can be shown that the particular industry is suffering because of importations. There is no pretense made here that labor is going to receive any of the benefits whatever out of these increases. There is no pretense made to that effect and, of course, labor will not receive any of the benefits unless labor can organize so that labor will have a bargaining power. But so long as labor has not the bargaining power it can not expect to receive a single dollar of benefit behind this wall of privilege.

All that the laborer can expect to receive behind this wall of privilege, sometimes erected in his name, will be the burden that will be heaped upon him in the increased cost of living for himself and his family.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I think the Senator has stated exactly my view of the matter, that where the industry is injured by importations, or, in other words, foreign competition which would lead to throwing out of employment American labor, it calls for treatment. I do not know of any other situation that would call for treatment in tariff legislation.

Mr. BLAINE. There is no proof here that importations are an element in the matter at all. If the Senator will go through Senate Document No. 30, he will find some interesting figures. The document is so inconveniently prepared, however—the Tariff Commission is not to blame because we wanted it on a wide sheet—that it is impossible to run one's eye along the lines the width of the sheet and be absolutely certain as to accuracy of statement; at least it can not be done expeditiously.

I find in the very first increase made by the House that the imports in value amount to only \$4,507. That is no competition. That importation does not justify any increase in the rate. In the next item showing a decrease by the House, the total importations are only \$81. If the experts were here they could

verify or correct my statement of the figures, because it is with difficulty that one may go through the figures in Senate Document No. 30 because of its very large size and arrangement.

I am convinced from the study I have made of the matter that the importations are quite inconsequential; in fact, they are of such minor importance that they can not be taken into consideration as an element relating to labor cost or the difference in the cost of production or as a competitive element respecting our domestic industries.

Mr. President, it has been suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and I think he has been eminently fair about it, that all he asks is an increase on a few items; but it has been suggested by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOR], chairman of the Finance Committee, that it is quite impractical to write a bill so that those items might be earmarked. I disagree with the chairman of the committee about that. I am sorry that I disagree with him because he has had a large experience in tariff matters; he has gone through the hearings and is quite familiar with the situation; but I want to suggest why I disagree with him.

Here we have the schedule prepared by the Tariff Commission containing many hundreds of items; at any rate every kind of cloth is specifically defined in the report. The Tariff Commission say that it is an easy matter, that it is a mere mathematical proposition. They so report when they report on paragraph 904. It will take a lot of time, a lot of study, and a lot of industry, but the tariff experts could no doubt prepare the schedule for us very quickly. However, if Members of the Senate should undertake it, it would take a lot of time. The various kinds of cloth are itemized showing the average yarn count and they could be classified and bear a specific rate.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Suppose we make inquiry now if it would be possible to limit this proviso to that class of cotton cloth where the average count is between 40 and 70?

Mr. BLAINE. Has the Senator any information as to importations of cloth with a count between 40 and 70?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. BLAINE. I have not analyzed that because it would take an immense amount of time and with my time so fully occupied by my service upon the lobby investigating committee and the Senate remaining in session from 10 o'clock in the morning until 10.30 at night, it is utterly impossible for me, or, indeed, for any Member of the Senate to make this kind of an analysis.

So, Mr. President, I want now to make this observation. I think it is a just criticism. Here we have pending an important schedule of the tariff bill that is going to affect the pocketbooks and happiness of millions of people in this country. We are now writing the most important bill that will be written during the term of any present Member of the Senate. I can not understand why there should be such haste; I can not understand why the "Young Turks" have suggested that they want to write any bill "in a reasonable time." My opinion is that we ought to write a reasonable bill, no matter what time it may take. The project is so great, the happiness and welfare of our people are so important, that the subject is worthy of the utmost consideration. Those who contend that increased duties will aid labor ought to have an opportunity and the time to present their views; those who claim that they will aid industry ought to have the time and the opportunity to present their views. I do not mean to make speeches. Speeches would be curtailed if the Members of the Senate had time in which to make proper analyses. The entire analysis which I have presented here this morning I prepared between adjournment last night and the opening of the session this morning. That is unfair to the Members of the Senate, but I am not concerned about our individual welfare or happiness or comfort. What I am concerned about is the welfare of the people of the country.

It does not concern us individually, but it does concern our people. It concerns the working man; it concerns industry; it concerns the farmer; it concerns the consumer; and every man, woman, and child is a consumer.

Hereafter I shall undertake to insist that we shall have a "reasonable time" within which to make proper analyses. Mr. President, I think if we had had the opportunity to analyze the bill, with the aid and assistance and ability and patriotism and loyalty of the Senator from Massachusetts to the best interests of the country, we could have saved much time in debate. More than that, we could have written a schedule, or certain paragraph, at least, that under the protective theory might afford protection to the working man and might afford protection to industry, without creating a great wall of privi-

lege behind which industries may organize their monopolies and their feudalism.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

Mr. BLAINE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I want to join with the Senator from Wisconsin in his criticism of the manner in which the bill is now being treated and considered in the Senate. I think it is deplorable that we have reached the stage by reason of day and night sessions where we have not now intelligent discussion because of the inability of Senators to find time outside of the hours devoted to the sessions of the Senate to review and study the evidence and the information that is at hand, with respect to the numerous protection questions in these various schedules. At best the subject of the tariff is involved and highly technical.

Mr. BLAINE. Under these circumstances, Senators are not responsible for inaccuracies of statement which they may make.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. We may have previously made mistakes in prolonged debate and unsound conclusions, but now we are not in a position to give thought or study or intelligent consideration to these important schedules. For the life of me I can not see why it is of supreme importance to get this bill passed next week or the week after. The important thing is that when the bill shall be passed to have it pass after the most favorable, ablest, and best discussion that can be had upon all phases and all questions involved in the measure. The public interest will be best served not by haste in the enactment of an undigested bill but by the enactment finally of a bill that shall have been thoroughly threshed out and thoroughly considered.

I can not exaggerate, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin, how strongly I feel against the insistence of the Senate on night sessions. I have not had time to confer with the leader upon this side of the Chamber, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], whose condition of health prevents him from being here at night. I have not had time to confer with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is in charge of the pending schedule. I have not had time to confer with the Senator from Wisconsin, or other Senators, not even with the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOR]. If we had even our nights to ourselves, we could sit down together and talk over some of these matters; we could exchange views and come to an intelligent determination and at least an agreement upon the facts.

The present procedure is an outrage, and the public ought to know that, whoever may be responsible for lashing us into the holding of continuous sessions from 10 o'clock in the morning until 10.30 at night, it is to result in a poorly drafted, ill-considered measure.

I want to say to the Senator that I agree fully with what he has said in reference to the manner in which we are being driven to consider the bill, with undue and improper haste, at the expense of the health of the Members of this body. I am amazed at the vitality that has been shown and the patience and the courage that have been displayed by certain Senators who have been here day after day and week after week during this long session. I tell you, Mr. President, that while they may be able to stand it now, a crack and a crash will come. I am not going to be responsible for it. No one can convince me that men of the age of those who are in this body, men who have been through the long summer months, day and night, giving their whole mind and strength to these problems, without opportunity of recreation, are not shortening their lives, are not hastening the end of their honorable careers by being obliged to remain in this Chamber during these days from 10 o'clock in the morning until 10.30 at night. It is the height of foolishness and folly; it is more than that, it is bordering on criminality. However, enough of that, because it is all in vain; the temper of this body is such—and it can not help but be such with these long hours—that they can not look at these questions fairly and consider them cautiously and carefully. We are being driven like a herd of cattle to take up this question and that question and adopt it or reject it without knowing what the real issue is.

Now I wish to speak to the matter which the Senator from Wisconsin has been discussing. I hope he will pardon me for taking so much of his time in referring to the matter of unduly long sessions, which I have just discussed. I should now like to say to the Senator that, from his point of view, he has made a very forcible presentation of the condition as he sees it in the textile industry as a whole. As to some of the things he has said regarding the prosperity of some branches of the industry, I would not differ from him at all; but it is unfortunate that he makes the speech he is making on this particular paragraph of the bill. On some of the paragraphs in this schedule he could make the speech he is now delivering most effectively, and the Senator is fair enough to say so. If he is convinced that there

is a case for protection and justice shown in any particular paragraph, he will be fair enough, I believe, to admit it. I know that to be so because he has shown during his career here an open-mindedness and fairness that is commendable.

But now, to come right to the point, what I am seeking to obtain for this unbleached cotton-cloth industry is not increased protection. What I am seeking is to prevent a reduction in the present protection by reason of a change of the system of levying rates which the House provided as compared with the present law. I will ask the Senator from Utah if that is not a fair statement in substance.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I first want to make an observation, and then I will yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I will not ask the Senator from Utah to answer the question now, because it is not fair to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BLAINE. If I could get a 3-foot ruler; if Grundy had only furnished us with a 3-foot ruler, I could add some very interesting information to this discussion.

Mr. SMOOT. There is a tape line on the table.

Mr. BLAINE. A tape line will not do; it worms around too much. I want to go on a straight line.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, it is not fair to the Senator to be continually interrupting him, but I should like to make just one other observation. What this proviso does is to correct the failure of the rates as provided by the House to give protection to all classes of the cotton-cloth industry. In other words, this proviso is the one amendment in this schedule which will enable the cotton-cloth industry, that part of the industry which is faced with serious competition from imports, to have not less than but at least as much and a little more by 3 per cent, I believe, than the present protection.

The grades of cotton cloth that are imported are between the counts of 30 and 70. That class of cloth, between these yarn counts, by reason of the change in the House rates, will not receive the same protection which it is receiving under the present law. That was all gone into, however, at length last night.

Mr. BLAINE. Let me say to the Senator that as to some grades of cloth there have been material importations, but as to a great many others there have been practically no importations. I want to point out that average yarn No. 58 of unbleached countable cotton cloth bore an ad valorem rate under the 1922 act of 45 per cent. The Finance Committee has increased that to 101½ per cent—an increase of over 100 per cent—and yet in 1928 only \$80 worth was imported.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. But that has no reference to any item in this paragraph.

Mr. BLAINE. We are discussing paragraph 904, and when paragraph 903 is discussed it also covers paragraph 904, because one is the basis of the other, as I understand it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have no information that leads me to the conclusion the Senator has reached about this paragraph. What he says may be true as to some other paragraphs.

Mr. BLAINE. Paragraph 903 is not analyzed by the Tariff Commission; paragraph 904 is analyzed, because paragraph 904 gives the basis of the progressive rates that are levied under the two sections. So when we are discussing paragraph 904 we are discussing also paragraph 903, and we can not discuss paragraph 903 without discussing paragraph 904. They go together. We might just as well put paragraphs 903 and 904 in one paragraph instead of in two paragraphs.

I want to add that there are many more increases, not so excessive, but very excessive where there are practically no importations whatever. Senators if they had time would very readily observe such to be the case.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. May I present just a thought there and then I will subside? The Senator has been very kind in yielding.

Mr. BLAINE. I was going to say that I am having a table made up covering the points I have been discussing, but it is such a tremendous task that I doubt if it can be furnished to me to-day.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. As the Senator well knows, unbleached cotton cloths are of many kinds. There are some mills that make a special grade, others another grade, and others still another grade. Very few of them make all the different grades because they require different looms and skill of a different kind, and some of the cloths produced vary greatly in value. So that though the imports may be small as to a number of grades, if they are large as affecting one particular grade of cotton cloth, they may put out of business this mill or that mill or another which is engaged in the manufacture of the

particular type of cotton cloth. In other words, we can not think of one mill as making all grades of cotton cloth. We have got to think of a mill here and a mill there, and a mill some place else that make different grades, different lines. One grade of cloth is not affected at all by imports, and yet another one may be very seriously affected by imports.

Mr. BLAINE. Can the Senator justify an excessive tariff rate on a cotton cloth of which there are only \$80 worth of importations?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I certainly can not justify that.

Mr. BLAINE. Such an industry ought to go out of business. The consumers ought not to be burdened with such an ineffective organization. I refer to an industry that can not compete against \$80 importation. The American people ought not to be burdened by some of these industries that clearly can not succeed unless they are paid a tremendous subsidy. Such factories that are closed ought to be closed.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator will recall that yesterday I opposed an increased duty on threads that are manufactured in my own State because the imports were only \$124,000, and there was no need of an increased duty. I opposed it.

I thank the Senator for his great generosity in yielding to me.

Mr. BLAINE. I call attention now to another item, just taken at random. On every page you can find all the way from ten to a score of these items. The average yarn No. 45 of the unbleached cotton cloth bore a rate of duty under the 1922 act of 21.25 per cent. The ad valorem equivalent was 30.21 per cent, and the Senate committee increased that to 39.64 per cent; and as I get the figures, using Mr. Grundy's yardstick here—and it is a poor one—the importations are less than \$4,000. There is no justification for imposing a tremendous increase of tariff where the importation is of such a small character.

Moreover, Mr. President, I desire to make an observation about the men who are in the silk industry. I am not referring to the Cheney's, who would like to build up here a monopoly, and create a sort of a kingdom with a feudal system where Mr. Cheney might be the king and his sons and daughters the princes and princesses. I am speaking of the rank and file of the silk manufacturers of the United States. They come in here and say, "We do not want any increases in the tariff rates." Why? They will tell you why. They will tell you that Japan and France have certain silk; that the French, especially, are great designers of color, of shade and mode. That silk comes into America. It is made by artisans of France, workmen who have engaged in the business for years, until they are highly skilled; and to a large extent it is hand-made, or, at least, the hand performs a large function in making the silk. That silk in America creates interest. It creates a demand. It establishes designs, figures. It advertises silk. The American manufacturer, to a certain extent, can imitate that silk, and thereby receive the benefits of the creations of another nation, and thereby increase the demand for silk identically the same as that Japanese silk; and so with cotton fabrics. The English fabric, the French fabric, create designs in cotton fabric, and their importations are negligible, but they are of assistance to the American textile industry in that they blaze the way in patterns, in colors, in designs. The American manufacturer is the beneficiary of the creations of a foreign country. The artisans do not get the benefit. Their importation is but little; but it is their brain and their skill and their workmanship that has made a fine design, created and beautifully applied. That appeals to the American people, and popularizes the use of such material; and the American textile manufacturers, through mass production, accept those designs, and they receive the benefit. So instead of these importations being a curse to the textile industry they are beneficial.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. BLAINE. I do.

Mr. COPELAND. Does not the Senator differentiate between a high tariff on a luxury like silk, and a tariff on a commodity within the reach of the mass of the people like cotton? I follow the Senator in his discussion about cotton; but when he discusses silk I have an entirely different viewpoint.

Mr. BLAINE. The only trouble with the Senator's question is that his premises are incorrect. Silk is no longer a luxury. Why, silk is in common use. The wholesalers to-day will sell a very fair grade of silk dress for about \$6.75 that can retail all the way—depending upon who the retailer is—from \$10 to \$12. The wholesaler can sell a very fine silk dress at wholesale for from \$10 to \$14 that retails in the market for all the way from \$15 up to \$24. Those dresses, those silk fabrics,

have ceased to be a luxury. The silk fabrics of to-day are going into the home of everyone, because they are economical. The silk fabrics make beautiful garments. They are light, they are agreeable, they will yield to a cleansing process that is not expensive. Their durability is great. Talk to the women of America and they will inform you that silk such as I have been discussing is no longer a luxury. It is the common possession of every family.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin further yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Do the constituents of the Senator from Wisconsin wear \$6 neckties? That is the kind of silk I am talking about. We have that silk, made on the Jacquard loom—

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, that is begging the question.

Mr. COPELAND. I do not think it is.

Mr. BLAINE. Oh, yes. The farmers of Wisconsin wear just as good neckties as does the Senator from New York, but they do not cost \$6. I mean no offense, of course.

Mr. COPELAND. If they are like the neckties of the Senator from New York they do not cost \$6, because he does not buy that kind; but there are high-grade silks which could be made in this country and give employment to people here without imposing any burden upon the common people of the country.

Mr. BLAINE. It is not the high-grade silks that I am talking about. I am talking about the silks that are worn generally in every family of the country.

Mr. COPELAND. I join the Senator in that.

Mr. BLAINE. The Senator's mind is going exactly in the same line that this bill is going. In order to protect certain high-grade materials this bill proposes to put an additional burden upon other qualities of cotton fabrics; and exactly the same thing is being attempted in the silk schedule.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator need not worry as far as my vote is concerned, because I dare say I shall vote on the cotton schedule exactly as he does.

Mr. BLAINE. I am not worrying about the Senator, and I am not criticizing him.

Mr. COPELAND. But the argument the Senator uses about silk, about these productions that come from abroad, if he will permit me to say so, I do not think is a good argument, because if we can build up in the United States of America great silk-producing establishments where these high-grade and expensive silks are developed we are going to give employment here to masses of people, and we are not going to impose any burden upon persons in this country who are not able to bear them.

Mr. BLAINE. The Senator fails to appreciate the full force of my argument. I think I ought to clear up the record. My contention is that the foreign creations, the French and Japanese silks, are of a high grade. They are made by artisans. They have the most beautiful designs and coloring in the world, and they are imported into America. The silk manufacturers who make the \$6 and \$8 and \$10 and \$15 and \$20 dress fabrics testify that these beautiful creations, these foreign creations, here in America stimulate the use of silk. It is an indirect method of advertising silk. So the American manufacturers of silk fabrics of the cheaper grades enjoy the benefits that come from popularizing the use of silk; and if we place an excessive tariff upon that silk, it is not going to come in. We shall be legislating against the silk manufacturers who produce the greater quantity of silk simply for the sake of taking care of some silk manufacturer who wants to monopolize the entire production of the higher-grade silks. I am for the silk industry that wants to continue popularizing the use of silks, because they do form a very important item in the wearing apparel of our women and children, not only because of their beautiful creations but as well from the standpoint of the health and the comfort of the women and children who wear those silks.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin further yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I do not think the Senator and I are far apart, but I want to go this far: I think the bill should be so written that those articles which can be commonly used in our country should be sold to our people as cheaply as possible; but when it comes to an article which is in the luxury class, if by a high tariff we can create here in this country—even though it may increase the cost of that article to the consumer—an industry which will give employment to thousands of people, I am in favor of such a tariff, and I think the Senator from Wisconsin would be. Am I not right in that?

Mr. BLAINE. But I think the Senator's premises are not correct. There is no creative genius in America in matters of

this kind. American production is not creative. It is not idealistic. It is mass production. Therein lies the mistake into which the Senator has fallen, in my opinion. Have I made myself clear now?

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator has made himself clear, but, of course, I do not agree with him.

Mr. BLAINE. No.

Mr. COPELAND. It would seem from what the Senator says that the American manufacturer, even if he were so stupid as not to have this ability himself—and I deny that—could at least send across the ocean and get a few samples of this fine product and could imitate it. Even the Senator admits that; but I do not believe for a minute that our manufacturers can not compete in artistic design or in finished product with any concern abroad, particularly in the field that I have in mind, the high-grade, expensive product. If we are going to tax anybody, if we are going to get any benefit whatever in the United States from a protective-tariff system, how can we dodge the fact that we can best do that by going into the manufacture of those expensive products where those who buy them are not concerned with price?

I will join the Senator in everything that has to do with the cheaper products for the common man, for the great mass of our people, because my people are just like his people; indeed, my people are more poverty stricken than his people are, and it is more important that they should have these cheap goods. But when it comes to the expensive goods, the Jacquard silks and the high-priced silks, I say, let us give them all the tariff they need, practically an embargo, if need be, in order to develop the industry in the United States.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, the rank and file of the silk manufacturers very heartily disagree with the Senator's viewpoint. I disagree with him. It is not that American industry is stupid; not at all. American industry is not stupid; American industry has brains. But American industry also has greed. It does not care for creations. What it wants is dividends, and that promotes mass production, and there is no art in mass production. In mass production is the substitution of the machine for the brain.

Mr. President, we have just as able men and women in the United States who might go into industry. They could produce as fine creations as any foreign creation, but they are not permitted to do it. All they are permitted to do is to stand by the machine and throw in the clutch or turn the button or thread the spinner or do some other physical act. They have no opportunity to develop the art that is within them. That is due to mass production.

Mr. President, these higher-grade fabrics, with very little importations, as I said, and I repeat, are the creations of art that have come down through many years, generation after generation, and by reason of the fact that they advertise silks because they contribute to the beauty and the joy of life, the rank and file of the silk manufacturers of this country say, "Let us take advantage of that advertising, let us continue to let those goods come in, and we, on the other hand, will abide by the present law, because we are able to compete with foreign production respecting the mass production which goes into the great mass of consumption in the United States." Therefore, when you are levying a high tax on these so-called luxuries, you are destroying the goose that lays the golden egg, you are destroying the very thing that makes it possible for the silk industries to have wide opportunities for the distribution of their output.

Now I want to get back to the bill. I do not think the Senator from New York and I are very much in disagreement.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I wish the Senator would let me say a word. The Senator spoke about the greed of the American manufacturer.

Mr. BLAINE. The greed; yes.

Mr. COPELAND. Is there any difference in that respect between the manufacturers in France and Germany or some other country and our manufacturers? Are they not all the same as regards greed?

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, there is a great difference between greed and art.

Mr. COPELAND. When they are combined there is certainly a combination which is irresistible. But talking about greed, go into some of the manufactories of Europe, I do not care where, and see how they work people, how their labor is worked from early morning to late at night, 12 or 14 hours. Greed! The center of greed is in the European and Asiatic manufactories. We are much more generous in our treatment of our people, and, so far as the art and the high quality of the product is concerned, I contend that the American manufacturer is just as capable as any foreign manufacturer in developing a high-grade product, and with just as fine treatment of the employees,

though perhaps not because he wants to give it to them. I do not want to defend the silk manufacturers. I have no reason to. I was nearly mobbed by them three or four years ago, when I spoke at their national convention in New York and proposed a bonus to the soldiers. They did all but throw me out of the building. But when it comes to an enterprise which has to do with the employment of labor in the United States, I propose to stand for a tariff which will make possible the development of those enterprises in the United States. When it comes to a product of cotton or of cheap silk, I am with the Senator 100 per cent. Both Senators from New York are with him. But when it comes to luxuries, I am willing to give just as high tariffs as necessary in order to bring about the making of those particular articles in the United States.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, there would be no special purpose in my entering into a controversy about the greed of foreign industries, Asiatic or otherwise. I have been discussing paragraph 904, and I used the silk industry by way of illustration, because it is probably the most outstanding in the field about which I have been talking.

All the Senator from Massachusetts asks is an increased tariff on some specific item. He can not, nor can I, nor can anyone else on the floor of the Senate, at this time point out the items where there is material competition, or detrimental competition. But I say it is unfair to place upon the backs of the American people this tremendous additional burden as to all cotton fabrics, or nearly all of them, just for the purpose of reaching these few.

For the reasons I have stated I hope the chairman of the Finance Committee will let this matter go over, so that the tariff experts may turn their attention to working out specifications respecting the items to which the Senator from Massachusetts has referred. Otherwise, it is not justifiable to adopt the increases of the Senate Finance Committee and I trust the increases may be defeated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which the Secretary will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 152, line 21, strike out the words "or colored" and insert the words "colored or woven-figured."

Mr. SMOOT obtained the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator from Georgia desires to speak upon the amendment, I will yield the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not desire to speak on the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to suggest an amendment, if the Senator from Georgia is not going to do so.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator from Utah that the Senate committee amendment, in line 21, page 152, the amendment now under consideration, be stricken out, and that we go back to the House language.

Mr. SMOOT. That would then fall in subdivision (c). I am perfectly willing to accept that suggestion.

Mr. GEORGE. I think that should be done.

Mr. SMOOT. The effect of it would be to increase the rate on these woven fabrics 10 per cent.

Mr. GEORGE. It carries them into subdivision (c), and adds greatly to the duty. I think what I have suggested ought to be done.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that be done.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I want to know what the effect is to be. I did not quite catch what the amendment of the Senator from Georgia was.

Mr. SMOOT. I will tell the Senator what the effect would be. If we disagree to the committee amendment, then woven-figured fabrics will be taken from paragraph 904 (a) and will fall in subdivision (c) on page 153, and it will be a reduction of 10 per cent on that class of goods.

Mr. WHEELER. Is the effect of it to disagree with the Senate committee amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; to disagree with the Senate committee amendment. Then, that article falls back to where it has been before, and there is a reduction in the rate of duty.

Mr. GEORGE. And that disagreement results in a decrease in duty upon the woven-figured goods. If that language remains in paragraph 904, it would have the effect of giving a 10 per cent increase under subdivision (c), and an additional 10 per cent under paragraph (d). The House language should be restored both in line 21 in section 904 (a), and also in line 9, subdivision (c), in the same paragraph.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I think it is the next amendment that is of the greater importance. I have no objection to that change being made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRISON. That means that the words "or woven-figured" are stricken out?

The VICE PRESIDENT. They are stricken out.

Mr. GEORGE. Now, may we disagree to the same language in line 9, subdivision (c)? That ought to come out also.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in subdivision (c), lines 9 and 10.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the amendment at the top of page 153.

The next amendment was at the top of page 153 to add to paragraph 904 (a) the following proviso:

Provided, That none of the foregoing shall be subject to a less duty than 0.55 of 1 cent per average number per pound.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I hope this amendment will be disagreed to likewise. I ask the Senator from Utah if the effect of this amendment is not to raise the tariff duties upon some of the textile goods.

Mr. SMOOT. This means that it will raise the rate of duty on a class of goods that would draw a lower rate under the provisions of the bill than under the existing law.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to be perfectly frank. It brings the rate up to that in existing law, and there is just a slight raise in that whole paragraph. That is what it does. In other words, it is virtually existing law, with the amendment we have stricken out in that paragraph.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I hope this amendment will be rejected.

As I said last evening I expect before the final passage of the bill to offer some amendments reducing many of the rates that were already in it even as it came from the House. The rates in the Underwood bill were, of course, lower than those in the old law, cutting them practically in half as I understand.

Mr. President, there has been a good deal said with reference to the cotton industry. I regret exceedingly that the schedule came up at this particular time, because I had understood that the sugar schedule and other schedules were coming up before this particular schedule was taken up, and consequently there was some detailed information that I expected to have which I do not have at this time. But for the benefit of the Senate and those Members who are not on the Finance Committee I think we ought to have before us the testimony that was given before the Senate Finance Committee by Mr. Shipley, who represented the National Council of American Importers and Traders. We ought to have it because of the fact that the things which he testified before the committee were uncontroverted and uncontrovertible. He called attention to the fact that the cotton manufacturers of the country have a virtual monopoly upon all the trade in this country and are exporting to Canada in large quantities—that they are competing in Canada with Great Britain while they are having to pay about 12 per cent more to get their goods into Canada than the British Government is having to pay.

It seems to me that the cotton schedule is one of the best examples of what the tariff policy of the Government has done to the people of the country, and what benefits the working people of the country have received as a result of the high-protective tariff. I think it was Mr. Grundy, testifying before the lobby committee, who pointed out the great benefits and the great blessings which have come to this country by reason of the high-protective policy which has been adopted by the Republican Party. He stated, as I recall from reading the newspaper accounts of his testimony, that if it had not been for the high-protective policy of the Republican Party this country never would have made the great progress it has. And every time an increase in a schedule is proposed in this body we immediately hear the cry go out, "We must do it for the benefit of labor; we must do it because of the fact that we want to keep up the high standards of living of the American workingman."

Yet, Mr. President, here we have an example in the cotton manufacturers of the country who have greater benefits under the protective-tariff system than almost any industry in the United States. They have not only received the greater benefits than almost any industry in the United States but they have absolutely had in almost every line a monopoly upon the American trade. What has happened and is happening? Today they are paying the lowest wages of almost any industry in the United States. They are paying wages that will not permit, if you please, a man with a family to live decently according to the standards laid down by the Department of Labor.

And now they are asking what? They are asking for an increase in the textile schedule. There is an old rule of equity known to every lawyer that he who seeks equity must do equity, and that when one comes into a court of equity he must come in with clean hands. They are here to-day and I say, Mr. President, that the hands of those who are seeking this increase in the tariff upon cotton are crimson because of the fact that they are seeking to enrich themselves by taking the lifeblood of the boys and girls of the country and by working women long hours and at nighttime in their industry. They are asking us to give them an increase in duties so that they can work more boys and more girls and so that they can work more women at night in their industry in order that they may make a few more dollars for themselves.

It has been said upon the floor of the Senate that some of the cotton industries in New England are not prosperous, and that is true; but it is not because of the fact that they have not had a sufficient tariff. It is not because of the fact, I repeat, that they have not had a sufficient tariff. It is because of the fact that some of the New England manufacturers have taken their money out of New England and gone into the States where they could employ the cheapest kind of labor, where they could employ children in their factories, and where they could employ women to work at night. Recently at one of the conferences held, I think in the city of Philadelphia, some of the cotton manufacturers of the country openly declared that what was wrong with the industry was overproduction. Nothing was said about their needing further tariff. It was overproduction, they stated; and the reason why they had overproduction was because some of the manufacturers of the country were working nights in their mills, were working children in their mills, and were working women at nighttime.

Think of an industry coming before the Congress of the United States asking to be granted an increase in duty when they do not pay the head of a family enough so that he can make a living, when they compel him, if he wants to stay in the industry, to have his wife work at night and to have his children work long hours. Do the American people want to keep going an industry that pays such miserable wages? Do the housewives of the country and the laboring people of the country want to pay further duties and have further duties placed upon them in order that the manufacturers can go and employ child labor and work the women of the country at all times of the day and night, 10 and 12 hours at a stretch? Yet that is what they are seeking to have done in this bill. The House of Representatives increased most of the duties and the Senate Finance Committee proposes to increase them still further.

Mr. President, I want to read from the testimony given by Mr. Shipley. He said:

Although the existing duties upon cotton manufactures imposed by the act of 1922 are the highest in our history, they would be substantially increased by the tariff bill recently passed by the House of Representatives and now under your consideration.

The 1922 bill gave to the cotton manufacturers of the country the highest duty in the history of the country, and notwithstanding that fact—

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I have been listening to the Senator's able speech. The Senator's last sentence was, and I believe I heard him aright, that the duties given to the cotton manufacturers in the 1922 act were the highest ever known.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. ASHURST. I think the Senator is correct; and in that connection I wish to say that whilst the cotton manufacturers and spinners in 1922 were here around the Capitol urging Senators and Members of the House of Representatives to vote for those high duties they were at the same time urging free trade on the staple of cotton.

Mr. WHEELER. I think that is correct.

Speaking further, Mr. Shipley said:

Our committee believes that the existing rates have proven amply protective and are substantially prohibitive; and that any further increase would serve no useful purpose but, on the contrary, be harmful to American commerce and industry as a whole and tend to increase the burden of the American consuming public by increasing the costs of a prime necessity of life. Our committee believes that this can be conclusively shown.

Then he goes on to point out the reasons why that is so.

It is our belief that, whatever may have been the requirements of the past, these facts will show that, broadly speaking, the American cotton-

textile industry to-day needs little or no protection by customs duties from foreign competition.

Raw material cheaper to American mills than to their foreign competitors: Most of the world's supply of raw cotton is grown at home. It is therefore cheaper to the American manufacturer than to his competitor. Special grades of cotton are grown in other parts of the world, but are equally available, since we have no duty upon raw cotton. Besides, there is convincing evidence in the recent testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means that American-grown cotton suffices.

Basic manufacturing costs lower in the United States than abroad: There is ample evidence to show that all of the ordinary processes of manufacture of the great majority of cotton cloths are now cheaper in America than in the principal competing countries.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. SACKETT] asked him—

Will you make that statement over again, the one that you made there?

Mr. SHIPLEY. Basic manufacturing costs lower in the United States than abroad: There is ample evidence to show that of all the ordinary processes of manufacture of the great majority of cotton cloths are now cheaper in America than in the principal competing countries.

That corroborates a statement which I made last night and which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] said was a very broad statement.

In their efforts before the Committee on Ways and Means to obtain higher duties, the American cotton manufacturers relied almost wholly upon the assertion that they could not maintain an American standard of wages unless they were accorded increased protection.

Think of it, Mr. President! The plea before the Ways and Means Committee was that they must have high tariff duties in order to maintain American standards of living. What were those American standards of living? Were they the \$8 and \$9 a week which were being paid women in some of the textile mills in the South? Were they the \$10 a week which were being paid to some of the textile workers of the country? Were they the \$11-a-week wages? Were they the \$13-a-week wages? Were the American standard wages of which they spoke the wages which they were paying the children who were working in the mills at night or in the daytime? Was the American standard of living of which they spoke the 60-hour week? If those were the standards of living of which they were speaking, and it is necessary, Mr. President, that an industry in this country must tax the consuming public in order that it may pay those wages and degrade American womanhood and degrade the children of the United States, then I say, Mr. President, that that kind of an industry is not worthy of protection in this country.

It is true—

Mr. Shipley says—

It is true that American textile wages, although lower than in any other great industry, are higher here than abroad, but this is now less true than before the World War. Comprehensive official evidence is lacking. There is great variation as between localities and individual plants. But it is believed to be broadly correct that American textile workers receive between one-third and one-half more than the corresponding workers in the principal competing country. But this difference is more than offset by the greater production of the American operative. Cotton manufacturing is now primarily a matter of machinery, in which America vastly excels. Automatic looms are the exception in those countries whose competition is feared; and will remain so as long as the foreign trade-unions maintain their traditional attitude toward labor-saving machinery.

Last evening I said, not from having read the statement of Mr. Shipley but from evidence which came to my notice while we were holding the preliminary hearings on the resolution which I presented providing for an investigation of the textile industry—and it is corroborated by Mr. Shipley—that by reason of mass production and automatic machinery in this country we produce more per unit, per man, than is produced in foreign countries.

Even if this attitude changes, which is extremely unlikely, many years and enormous capital would be required to alter the relative situation. On the other hand, automatic looms are the rule in America. We have no recent official statistics at hand, but in 1911 the Tariff Board reported to Congress that there were less than 3,000 automatic looms in all of Great Britain, while there were then about a quarter of a million in America. Probably this ratio has not materially changed.

I think it was one of the members of one of the trade-unions—Mr. Mahan, if I am not mistaken—who testified that conditions had not very materially changed in Great Britain since that time.

The number of looms that may be operated by one weaver varies, of course, with conditions and the skill of the weaver. In general, the foreign weaver operates 1 or 2 looms, with a maximum of 4, while the American weaver operates from 6 to 20, with a maximum of 36.

"With a maximum of 36," this gentleman states; but I likewise think that the testimony taken before the Committee on Manufactures shows that not only were they required to operate 36 but in some instances they are required at the present time to operate as many as ninety-odd looms.

Mr. WILCOTT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WILCOTT. May I explain that situation very briefly?

Mr. WHEELER. I will be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. WILCOTT. When the Senator says from the record that weavers are operating 36 looms apiece, it means that they are using the Draper automatic loom which makes the coarser grades of cloth. The number of looms that a weaver can run depends entirely on the construction of the cloth. Weavers abroad may be more skillful operators than weavers in this country, and might, under the same circumstances and given the same machinery, operate more looms than weavers operate here. But the foreign weaver running fine yarns and operating looms which weave very high-grade and fancy cloth may run only one loom; at the outside he may run two or three. However, when it comes to the coarse cloth with a small number of picks per inch, using a coarse yarn, they can, if they are operating automatic looms, run, with no more exertion, as high as 36 looms.

I thought I ought to amplify this point so that the Senate may understand that the individual is certainly not giving out any more man power in operating 30 or 36 coarse looms than the weaver abroad who is operating one or two fancy looms, and not nearly so much skill is required.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I will have to challenge the statement made by the Senator to the effect that the weaver does not expend any more energy when he is operating 36 looms than when he is operating one. But, nevertheless, the fact is that when one man operates 1 loom and another 30 automatic looms the latter turns out more units per man than the weaver who operates 1 loom. That is the reason why I stated that in this country we can compete with the foreign product notwithstanding the slight difference in the cost of the wages of the employees in this country.

Mr. Shipley goes on to say:

In addition, the automatic loom may be run at a higher speed. A conservative estimate is that the American weaver with automatic looms averages six times the production of a foreign weaver with ordinary looms. Obviously, an advantage of 33 per cent, or even 50 per cent in wages is nullified by a difference of 600 per cent in productive capacity. To illustrate the bearing of this particular element of wage cost to tariff protection, it may be noted that an automatic loom run at a speed of 180 picks will produce a fairly fine cloth at the rate of 2 inches per minute. Thus, with 30 looms a single weaver can produce 4,800 yards of cloth per week of 48 hours, of a dutiable value of 15 cents per yard, or \$720 for the week's production. The duty under the proposed law for such a cloth would be about 25 per cent, or actually \$180. The weaver's wages would be about \$18; so that the protection, so far as this element is concerned, would be ten times—

I repeat—ten times—

the total wages, or 1,000 per cent, even if the foreign weaver received nothing at all.

Yet, Mr. President, the Republicans stand here on the floor of the Senate and say we need higher tariff duties, if you please, for the protection of American labor and to maintain the standards of living of the American workingman. Notwithstanding these uncontroverted facts the mill owners are not only working their employees 48 hours a week, as Mr. Shipley says, but they are working them 60 hours a week, and the workers are not only operating 36 looms in some mills, but they are operating as high as 90 looms in some of the mills. When we compute those figures what do we find? We find that the figures which he gives here would be more than doubled.

If the foreign weaver were paid two-thirds of the American weaver's wages, the protection upon this differential would be 3,333 per cent.

He is basing it upon the operation of 36 looms, and he is basing it upon a 48-hour week. Compute, if you will, what it would mean if they were operating 72 looms or 90 looms, and working 60 hours a week.

Nor can this be brushed aside as a *reductio ad absurdum*, for the actual differences make the comparison even more remarkable. For

although the protection is to the American cloth, the duty is upon the foreign cloth, and the foreign weaver has nothing like the output upon which this calculation is based, and must work nearly nine weeks to produce the same amount of cloth. The foreign loom will not run so fast, nor can the weaver run so many. But for the sake of fairness assume a maximum speed of 150 picks per minute, and allow the weaver the maximum of four looms. This shows a maximum production of 533 yards of cloth for a wage of \$12 for the same week in which the American weaver produces 4,800 yards for a wage of \$18. We leave it to our friends on the other side to find a way to equalize this difference in terms of tariff percentages; but will point out that the net result upon such a basis is that the weaving cost in America is about one-quarter of 1 cent per yard, while the cost abroad is about 2½ cents.

Mr. President, I should like to see the Senator from Kansas, for instance, go back to the farmers of his State and tell them that he wants to raise the duty upon cotton textiles in order to maintain American standards of living for the working men of the East.

Admittedly, there are other elements which must be taken into consideration, but this simple illustration, the substantial accuracy of which may be verified by anyone in a few minutes' study of loom operations, and a knowledge of simple arithmetic, should carry an important lesson to those who still believe that American labor can not compete with foreign because it is more highly paid. A similar relative state of facts will be found to obtain in many of the other processes incidental to cotton manufacturing.

An illustration of efficiency and high duty: To emphasize the efficiency of American fine-cotton mills the representative of the National Council of American Cotton Manufacturers, representing 85 per cent of the American spindles, before the Committee on Ways and Means, said (p. 4473):

"* * * our fine-goods mills can produce a yard of cloth containing 4½ miles of yarn, and do all the operations necessary to manufacture it for approximately 9 cents, conversion cost, above the material.

"That would seem to compare favorably with any other industry for efficiency."

Mr. Shipley goes on to say:

This statement was moderate and well within the facts. Its special importance is that it illustrates two vital points at issue: First, that American mills are the most efficient in the world so far as manufacturing costs are concerned, for it is doubtful if that achievement is equaled anywhere; and second, that the protection accorded in the proposed bill to this very yard of cloth exceeds the total conversion cost. In the absence of those minute specifications necessary to ascertain the exact rate of duty, it may for purposes of illustration be assumed that a cloth meeting this general description would be dutiable at 40 per cent and have a dutiable value of 30 cents per yard.

Notwithstanding that fact, Mr. President, in the present bill they have increased that duty.

Imports are a negligible proportion of the domestic production. There is ample evidence, and it is generally admitted, that the total imports of cotton cloth are less than 0.8 of 1 per cent of the domestic production.

Less than 0.8 of 1 per cent of the domestic production are the imports!

This fact of itself would seem to dispose of any question of a need for increased protection. But the advocates of higher duties argue that the industry is endangered by the importations of the finer cloths. Whatever this danger may be, it can not have much effect upon the industry as a whole.

That is the plea that is made here to-day for this very item—that upon the finer cloths we must have a higher duty. We must stop up the gap. The manufacturers of this country already have a practical embargo upon all of the cheaper grades of cloth; and now, to use the language of one of the proponents of this increase, we must stop up the gap by increasing the duty on the finer grades of cloth. Not satisfied with reducing the imports of the lower grades of cloth to 0.8 of 1 per cent, they now propose, if you please, to stop up the further gap, so that the whole industry will have an embargo upon every class of cloth produced in the United States of America!

The statistics submitted by the manufacturers themselves to the House committee (p. 4487, House print) show that out of a total production of about one and three-quarters billion pounds, only about twenty-two and one-half millions were cloths finer than number 60s. So that at most this danger, real or imaginary, could affect only about 1½ per cent of the domestic production.

Against 98 per cent of the domestic cloth the importations are only 0.004 of 1 per cent.

Think of it, Mr. President! Only 0.004 of 1 per cent! And they are asking for an increase of the duty so that they can shut out that 0.004 of 1 per cent!

The figures above quoted show that of all cotton cloth produced in the United States, 1,706,360,232 pounds, or 98.3 per cent, were number 60s or lower, and that the imports in the same classes were only 6,893,133 pounds, or 0.00404 per cent. A further analysis shows that over 94 per cent of the domestic production was of cloths not finer than 40s; and that the importations in this class amounted to but 0.00279 per cent. Yet the proposed bill provides substantial increases in duties upon all of these, and taxes them as high as 37 per cent if of ordinary construction, and as high as 47 per cent in some cases. Our exports vastly exceed our imports.

Mr. President, he quotes now from the Tariff Commission:

Speaking of cotton cloth, the United States Tariff Commission says: "Our exports have exceeded our imports in every year since 1875."

Since 1875! Why, one Senator last night stood on the floor and said that they were only asking for a small amount of increase. Of course, Mr. President, they are asking for a comparatively small amount. They are asking for only 10 per cent in some cases, in some instances only 3 per cent, but in some instances it has been doubled; but they are asking it because at the present time, under the act of 1922, they have the highest tariff that they have ever had in the history of this country.

This ratio of excess has on the average steadily increased until in 1928 the exports were eight and one-half times the imports in quantity and five times in value. These exports in the main were in open competition with the world.

Mr. President, as he states, these exports were in open competition with the world. They were competing with Japan; they were competing with England; and, as is pointed out a little further on, they were not only competing with England in countries that were not controlled by the British Isles, but they were likewise competing with Canada, and they had to pay a differential of 12 per cent, and still the American manufacturer was able to compete with Great Britain in Canada after having paid a differential of 12 per cent.

The representative of the National Council of American Cotton Manufacturers—

He says—

in his argument for higher protection before the Committee on Ways and Means, sought to explain away these exports by attributing them in large measure to the proximity of our markets, especially emphasizing the Canadian market. But, on the contrary, the fine trade we do with our neighbor to the north is done under adverse not favorable conditions. For our competitor there is Great Britain, who enjoys a preferential abatement of the Canadian tariff. So in that market we are not only able to compete upon an even basis, but actually against a handicap amounting to about 12 per cent. There is very little difference between the costs of rail transportation from our mill centers and the ocean transportation from Lancashire.

Senator SACKETT. Have you the amount of imports from Canada under those conditions?

Mr. SHIPLEY. I have not them at hand, Senator.

This presents the anomalous situation of our mills being able to compete with our most formidable rival against a handicap of 12 per cent in the Canadian market, but unable to compete in our home market unless protected by a tariff of 20 or 30 or 40 per cent.

And, I might add, under this bill, as high as 60 per cent; and I might add that we are doing it in order that we can "keep up the standard of the American laboring man" when we are paying in these mills and in these factories \$9 a week, \$10 a week, \$11 a week, \$13 a week, and when we are working their children 14 years of age and 16 years of age, and when it is necessary for the mother of these children to work in the factory beside her husband in order to buy sufficient food to keep their bodies and souls together!

That, Mr. President, is what the high protective tariff in this country has done for the American people. Oh, yes; Mr. Grundy says that we have prospered because of our tariff! We have prospered, Mr. President, in spite of our high protective system, because no country with the vast natural resources we have had could do otherwise than prosper as we have.

Then Mr. Shipley says:

Let us again quote from the United States Tariff Commission:

"Our exports are widely distributed. * * * Among the smaller purchasers may be noted the United Kingdom which in 1925 bought over 6,500,000 yards valued at over \$1,500,000."

Not only is this an illustration of our ability to "carry coals to Newcastle," but it should be noted that the average value of these

goods was about 22 cents per yard, putting them well into the class of fine cloths upon which our mills especially fear competition from that same customer.

The Tariff Commission says further:

"The United States is the largest producer of cotton cloth, and in export trade is exceeded only by Great Britain and Japan. * * * Imports are due primarily to the quality of certain grades rather than to general price competition. The relative importance of the price factor varies and at times it is the deciding factor on a limited number of fabrics, but normally the more important factors appear to be quality, reputation, lack of domestic production, and specialty demand. * * * On the staple goods made of yarns not finer than 40s, there is practically no competition from abroad; the domestic mills, aided particularly by their greater use of automatic looms, can produce and export most of such goods in competition with the world."

That is the finding, if you please, of the United States Tariff Commission. They can make them and compete with the world; and yet we place a tariff upon the consuming public, upon the housewife, upon the farmer, and upon the laboring people of this country, in order to protect this industry so that they may employ children and women long hours!

He says:

Please note that this is the language of the United States Tariff Commission in an official communication to Congress.

The foregoing are some of the more general reasons upon which our committee opposes the increases in the proposed bill.

Then he takes up a large number of the duties which I shall not take the time of the Senate to read.

Mr. President, in the debate in the Senate with reference to cotton textiles in 1922, the late Senator La Follette talked upon this subject for practically two days, I think. He spoke in opposition to the tariff duties in the bill of 1922, which were and are the highest this country has ever seen up until the time when the House had the Hawley bill, and that was the highest until the Senate committee increased some of those duties.

Senator La Follette took up the earnings of some of the cotton manufacturing companies. He took up particularly one of the largest manufacturing concerns in the world, the Amoskeag Manufacturing Co., which is located in New Hampshire and in many places in New England, but largely, I think, in New Hampshire.

He points out that in 1910 they made \$760,000, in 1911 they made \$721,000, in 1912 they made \$1,104,000. Then the Underwood-Simmons law went into effect on the 3d day of October, 1913, and it will be recalled that in that law the tariff on cotton schedules was cut practically in two.

In 1913 the Amoskeag Co. carried to surplus and dividend account \$1,106,427, as shown by their report; in 1914 it was \$1,022,000, in round figures; in 1915 it was \$1,079,000; in 1916 it was \$1,079,000; in 1917 it was \$1,333,000; in 1918, under the Simmons-Underwood law, it was \$5,062,000. That is one of the companies which has largely increased its stock in the last few years.

The next company he took up was the Beacon Manufacturing Co. This is what Sanford & Kelley had to say about the Beacon Manufacturing Co., "one of the largest cotton-manufacturing companies in the country, with mills at New Bedford, Mass.":

This company has over \$225 a share in surplus of net quick assets behind each preferred share of \$100 par value and net tangible assets at the book value are over \$375 a share.

These figures are obtained after inventories are marked down to present market levels or to the lowest price of raw materials, finished goods, and supplies have reached in many years. After these write-offs in inventories have been made the company earned for the calendar year 1920 over 100 per cent on the amount of outstanding preferred stock. In the six previous years it also earned an amount equal to 100 per cent of its outstanding preferred stock. * * * The Beacon Manufacturing Co. makes cotton blankets. The superior quality and low retail price of the blankets have caused it to be necessary for the Beacon Co. to constantly year after year tremendously increase the size of their plant. This has been done almost entirely from profits of operation, as their capital to-day is \$1,200,000, which compares with \$800,000 in 1914. In that year their total sales were \$1,800,000, by 1920 the plant had been so increased that they sold \$7,627,000 of product. This gain in sales is not entirely due to increased output, because the selling price of their blankets was doubled in the last few years.

The next company taken up was the Dartmouth Mill, about which he said:

At the annual meeting of the Dartmouth Mill, held in November, the corporation reported net earnings of \$567,254. Their balance sheet showed also a reduction in inventory account of nearly \$45,000. They

paid in dividends during the year on the common stock 32 per cent. In 1920 they paid 34 per cent; in 1919, 14 per cent; in 1918, 12 per cent.

The next was the Holmes Co., and the Senator said:

This stock is now selling, according to Sanford & Kelley, at \$300. I quote from their report:

"The mill was started in about 1910, and the common stock sold at par. Therefore, in 12 years the investor has seen the market value of his stock trebled and has been receiving dividends since 1916 of 20 per cent or more; in 1920 he received 38 per cent."

Mr. President, that was under the Simmons-Underwood tariff bill, in which the tariffs were just about one-half what they were in the 1922 law, and I venture to say they were about one-third what they will be in the pending bill, with the increases that have been made by the House and the Senate committee.

Mr. SACKETT. Mr. President, will the Senator give the dividends of the last company he mentioned from 1924 to the present time?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not have the dividends for 1924.

Mr. SACKETT. I would like to read them into the RECORD.

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. SACKETT. In 1924 they paid 9½ per cent; in 1925 they paid 6 per cent; in 1926 they paid 4 per cent; in 1927 they paid nothing; in 1928 they paid nothing.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, they were making those profits in 1922, prior to the time the tariff duties were raised. Tariffs were raised in 1922, almost doubled. Then the Senator shows these figures, to point out, notwithstanding the tariff raise of 1922, they have not been paying as much in dividends.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. WHEELER. That shows to me conclusively that the tariff increase in 1922 had nothing to do with the condition, because if they made these profits under the 1913 law, why could they not make more under the 1922 law, which increased the tariff rates?

I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator has really answered the question I had in my mind. In other words, an increase in the tariff is asked when there is a demonstration that under any fair consideration an increase in tariff did not help these companies. Their trouble—and they are having trouble now, everybody concedes—does not come from the tariff. In fact, under the Underwood law, when the tariff rates were way below what they are in the present law, these companies made the large profits referred to. Under the present law the profits went down until they made nothing. The women of the country commenced to wear silk, silk stockings were fashionable, silk underclothes were fashionable, everything was silk. Putting a tariff on the cotton products will not help that situation. It is no remedy, unless we are going to prohibit our people from wearing silk.

The women of the country do not wear as many clothes as they used to. The consumption, even if they were wearing cotton, would not be as great as it was before. I said in the Senate once that the present-day woman goes out dressed in the very height of style, in fashionable attire, and has on fewer clothes than her grandmother wore when she went to bed. [Laughter.] All that, of course, has an effect. The demand is not as great, and, in addition to that, men and women both are using silk instead of cotton.

If it could be shown that when these companies' profits were low, as the Senator from Kentucky has just read the figures, when they made less and less, until they declared no dividends whatever, assuming they had been efficient, and had been doing business properly and honestly, they were driven out of business because of competition from abroad, then there would be some sense in asking for an increase in tariff.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, of course that is true, but there is not in the RECORD any evidence, and they can not produce any evidence, that it was competition from abroad that caused the trouble, because of the fact that in most instances the imports into this country are from four-tenths of 1 per cent to two-tenths of 1 per cent of the exports. So, surely, it was not that.

On the other hand, one of the reasons, let me say to the Senator from Nebraska, why some of these northern mills could not compete, was the matter of low wages in the South, the long hours, the speed-up system, and the overproduction from night work. What the Senators from New England ought to advocate, if a tariff is so beneficial, is a tariff against the importation of goods from the Southern States into New England. That is what they ought to advocate if they are really high protectionists, because if it is a good thing to keep the goods out of the country generally, it ought to be a good thing for New England

if they would keep out the goods from South Carolina, North Carolina, and some of the other States.

Mr. SACKETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SACKETT. I did not quote those figures for the purpose of making any deduction as to the need of a tariff, but simply because I felt that it was only fair to give the full list of dividends, which the Senator did not have. He read the war-time and the subsequent to the war-time dividends, and then it was apparent that the business fell off, because they were not able to pay dividends later on. I do not believe there is any real feeling here, but that the textile industry is in some difficulties.

Mr. WHEELER. In certain parts of the country.

Mr. SACKETT. Whether it is because of the lack of tariff duties, or whether it be from internal competition, or what the reason of it is, there is great unemployment to-day in many parts of the textile industry.

Mr. WHEELER. In certain parts of the country; but let me call the Senator's attention to the fact, as I did a moment ago, that at one of the conferences held not so long ago in the city of Philadelphia, several of the northern manufacturers pointed out that the trouble with the industry was that there was overproduction and too much night work in some of the factories.

Mr. SACKETT. That was pointed out by some of the witnesses and other witnesses gave other reasons. As a member sitting on the Finance Committee, I found it very difficult to analyze the evidence and determine exactly the trouble with the industry. Evidently the use of substitutes, as the Senator from Nebraska has suggested, had a great deal to do with the falling off of the business. Evidently there are some particular counts of yarns in the making of the cloth that does come in from abroad that might just as well be made in this country. There are other reasons that have been developed in the testimony, and I do not believe we can lay down any one rule to cover the whole thing. The business is sick and it is unfortunate for the people who live by it, whether they own or whether they work in it, that we are not able to find some way to help it. I think it would be a good thing if we could. I can not say that I agree entirely with the action of the Finance Committee. I was opposed to it in many particulars as to the kind of protection that should be afforded, but I do feel we have a real trouble in the industry, and we ought to work constructively and not destructively and try to build it up.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I agree entirely with the Senator, but I could not understand how, in the face of the facts, the Ways and Means Committee of the House could raise these duties, and then the Finance Committee of the Senate could go ahead and raise the duties further.

I appreciate that Mr. Grundy's views are the views of a majority of the Republican Party, to the effect that the higher we get the tariffs the better it is for this country, and the better it is for the workingman, and the better it is for industry. So persistent has Mr. Grundy been, so persistent have the manufacturers' associations of New England and of Pennsylvania and of other States been with reference to this theory of government, that they have convinced the farmers of the country that the thing they must have now is a high tariff on everything they raise, regardless of whether it is going to be of any benefit to them at all or not.

The farmers say, "We want a tariff upon tomatoes, we want a tariff upon peanuts, we want a tariff upon every single thing we raise"; and over in the House, I understand, they even went so far as to advocate a tariff on bananas, so that people would eat more apples in this country.

If we follow Mr. Grundy's theory further, the people will come to say we have started a hothouse up here, and want a protective tariff against everything we can raise in the hothouses of this country. This is one illustration of where we have had a protective tariff from the very beginning of this Government, where we have had the highest protection, and are paying the lowest wages, yet the industry is still sick.

He next takes up the Neild Mill.

This mill has been paying quarterly dividends of \$5 a share, or at the rate of 20 per cent in cash dividends. Of this concern Sanford & Kelley report:

"If the Neild can earn 20 per cent on its capital in one of the worst years ever known in the cotton industry, what will it earn in normal times? It should be remembered in considering the dividends being paid by the Neild that they have not had many years to accumulate surplus earnings to pay off their debts as have many of the older companies. 'It is therefore worthy of remark,' says Sanford & Kelley, 'that in the last five years they have paid successively 18, 19, 20, 32, and again 20 per cent.' In spite of these disbursements in five years, amounting to considerably more than their capital stock, they can yet show a surplus

of more than 100 per cent in their surplus of net quick assets. This, too, in spite of the tremendous taxes which the corporation has had to pay because of its large earnings, because of excess-profits taxes."

The next one he takes up is the Pierce Mill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. As to the Neild Manufacturing Co., of course, in the first place they make specialty goods. They do not make the ordinary, common goods used by the mass of the people. Their dividends in 1924 were 12 per cent; in 1925, 12 per cent; in 1926, 12 per cent; in 1927, 12 per cent; and in 1928, 9 per cent. Those were the dividends paid. I have here the reports on all of the cotton mills in the Fall River district and also the Bedford cotton mills.

Mr. WHEELER. Beginning with what year?

Mr. SMOOT. Beginning with 1891.

Mr. WHEELER. I would be glad indeed if the Senator would put them in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. When I address the Senate I shall do so. The Senator refers to the years 1913 and 1914. All cotton mills, it did not make a particle of difference where they were or what they were then, made money because of the war. Just as soon as the war was over, most of the cotton mills began to lose money and most of them have not paid a dividend since. Later I shall put the figures in the RECORD.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, he next takes up the Whitman Mills. Has the Senator the Whitman Mills figures there?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I am quite sure I have. I have them all.

Mr. WHEELER. With reference to the Whitman Mills he said:

This is one of the largest and oldest mills in the country, and was reorganized in 1895. Again, referring to the stock of this company, this same report says:

"A man who owned 20 shares at that time—1895—and took new stock as it was offered to him afterwards now has 40 shares, which cost him \$3,800 and are worth about double that amount in the market to-day. From the distributions of all kinds he has received in dividends since 1895 on what cost him \$3,800 the sum of \$8,034.50."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, did the Senator say the Weathermore mills?

Mr. WHEELER. No; the Whitman Mills.

Mr. SMOOT. That is a New Bedford concern. I have the Whitman figures here. The Whitman Corporation dividend in 1924 was 9½ per cent; in 1925, 6½ per cent; in 1926, 3 per cent; in 1927 no dividend at all; and in 1928 no dividend at all.

Mr. WHEELER. Was not that due to the fact that during that period of time they had some strikes in the Fall River district and the factories were closed down part of the time because of the strikes?

Mr. SMOOT. That was back in 1926. Then the dividends dropped from 9½ to 3 per cent, and since that year they have not paid any dividend at all.

Mr. WHEELER. It has been partially due to overproduction and partially due to the fact of the labor trouble they had there in New England at that time.

Mr. SMOOT. There is hardly a mill in the Fall River district that has paid a dividend since outside of those that make specialty goods. I was dumbfounded when I received these returns to find that to be the fact.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator does not contend that that is because of the fact they have not had enough tariff, does he?

Mr. SMOOT. More than likely it would have assisted them. I could not say to what extent.

Mr. WHEELER. How can the Senator contend that it is because of the fact that we have not had sufficient tariff when in 1922 the Congress raised the tariff, and in view of the fact that most of the mills in the country have been producing much more than we consume, and our imports have been about 0.4 of 1 per cent?

Mr. SMOOT. I recognize that during war times they did make awful profits. There is no doubt about that. But following that time there have been two main causes for their condition, as I see it. One is the change in styles. There is no doubt in the world that that has affected the cotton mills most seriously. The other reason is that the importations, though small compared to the amount of production here, have set the price, and that price had to be met or else they would have had to close down. Those are the two reasons by which I account for their condition, with the exception of the difference in wages. Wages in the districts I have mentioned are nearly twice what they are in other districts making the same goods in the United States.

Mr. WHEELER. I am perfectly astounded to hear the Senator from Utah say that because of imports amounting only to 0.4 of 1 per cent we ought to have a tariff to shut them out altogether.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; I did not say that.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, that is the theory. The Republican Party has gotten away from the protective tariff and from the competitive theory, from the theory of the difference in the cost of labor at home and abroad, and the theory now is an embargo upon everything produced in any other country. That is the theory as the Senator stated a moment ago.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator misunderstood what I had in mind. I would never concede any such thing as that. He asked what the reasons were, and one was, as I stated—

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator does not contend, because of the fact that we import only 0.4 of 1 per cent of the amount produced in this country, that the importations fix the price of the articles made in this country, and that because of that fact we must increase the tariff and shut out those importations of 0.4 of 1 per cent?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator had waited I would have concluded my statement, which I was not able to do. I want the Senator to understand that I do not think for a moment that importations of 1 per cent of goods into the United States, as compared with the amount produced in the United States, should justify an additional rate. The Senator will find that out when we consider the following paragraph in the schedule, which will disclose my attitude on the question.

What I want to say is that it is because of the changes in styles and the competition here to maintain the local trade among the mills of the United States wherever overproduction is taking place—and it has taken place, and there is no doubt about it. I think that is the reason why the prices of cotton goods have been cut so low and that there has not been any profit to anybody outside the four or five mills in the two districts I have referred to in Massachusetts which make specialty goods. There are only about four or five of them that have made a dollar during this time.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the Senator is correct when he says that the Massachusetts mills have not made any money; neither have the northern mills generally. I think there is no question of doubt that one of the reasons is because of the fact of night work in the mills in the South and because of cheap labor in the South and long hours and the stretch-out system. Instead of raising the tariff in the bill now before us, why does not the Finance Committee recognize these facts and why does not the industry itself recognize these facts and try to change them within itself instead of coming to the Congress of the United States and asking for an increase or an embargo upon every class of cloth that is produced in the country?

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HEBERT. Is the Senator aware of the fact that there is practically no competition between the northern mills and the southern mills on the finest grades of goods, and that really that has not been the cause of the lack of success of the northern mills?

Mr. WHEELER. I am aware of the fact that a great many northern mills have taken their money and invested it in the South because of the fact that they could get cheaper labor in the South. I am aware of the fact that a great many of the mills from the Senator's State, or at least some of the mills from his State and some of the capitalists from the State of Massachusetts, because of the fact that they could go South and exploit labor and get cheaper labor down there, because they could work children in the mills when they could not do it in Massachusetts and in Rhode Island, and because of the fact that they could work women at night in the mills down there, have taken their money and gone into the South and invested it in the South. Nobody knows that any better than I do because I was born in New England and I know that is the kind of patriotism there is in Massachusetts and in Rhode Island among some of the cotton manufacturers there who have made their money in New England, who made their wealth there, who piled up their fortunes there, and the minute they could see where they could make a few more dollars by going into the South where they could work children in the factories, they immediately left New England and went into the South to do that.

Mr. HEBERT. The Senator is aware that there are as many mills in Rhode Island as there have been at any time and that those which have stopped have done so because they could not find a market for their products; is he not?

Mr. WHEELER. They could not find it because of the facts I have stated. The southern mills have been working. They have been working night and day.

Mr. HEBERT. I have already stated to the Senator, and he has agreed with me, that there is no competition on the grades of goods that are manufactured in the North with those manufactured in the South.

Mr. WHEELER. I have not agreed with it at all, because I could not answer the Senator, and I do not know. But I do know, as I said a moment ago, that the Senator's New England manufacturers who boast of their patriotism and who have wanted a high tariff because of the fact it is necessary to keep up the wages of their workmen in New England, the minute they found they could get labor cheaper some other place, the minute they found they could work their laborers longer hours and could run their factories at night with children and women, forgot their patriotism toward New England, where they made their money, and moved out of there and went wherever they could grind down labor, wherever there were no labor organizations to keep up wages and conditions of labor, and where there were no laws to keep them from paying a miserable wage. That is a thing, Mr. President, that I am glad the Senator from Rhode Island has brought up in the discussion.

Every manufacturer comes here and says, "I am doing this because I want to be patriotic. I want a high tariff so I can keep up the American standards for the American laboring man." But let him find for one moment where he can get away from labor organizations, where he can get away from laws making him keep decent hours and pay decent wages, and he immediately takes his capital and goes there in answer to the advertisements of some chamber of commerce telling him to come down there because he can exploit their people and pay them low wages and work their people long hours and work the children in their factories.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am rather surprised at the Senator from Montana, an intelligent man, looking around and seeing the conditions that exist in America, that he should get up in the Senate of the United States and make a plea based on justice and hope, and thinking that is going to offset the material arguments that can be brought against it. Does he not know that in America, if one can make money out of a proposition, any amount of injustice and unfairness does not count at all?

Mr. WHEELER. It would seem so when we have a tariff bill before us. As I have said repeatedly on the floor of the Senate, it does make one lose his idealism when he sees the sordid way in which a tariff bill is written in the Congress of the United States. There is no thought of the consuming public in the country, no thought of the workers of the country at all, no thought of the man upon the farm excepting in the speeches that are made here upon the floor of the Senate. Every speech that has been made in favor of an increase in the tariff rates has been made in the name of the farmer and in the name of the workman.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am really very fond of the Senator from Montana, and I just want to caution him that if he continues to go on in the manner he has adopted this morning that soon he may be deported to Russia as a communist.

Mr. WHEELER. There are many who would have liked to deport me a long time ago, and probably would now; in fact, I understand in the city of Chicago there is a man by the name of Jung, or some such name as that, who is already starting in with propaganda trying to raise money from the Power Trust and from the manufacturers of the country to do that very sort of thing with a number of Senators and Members of the House who do not agree with the Power Trust and the mill owners and the coal barons and a few others. He is going to start out with a lot of propaganda to brand us all as Bolsheviks and say we ought to be deported. I know that it will not be very pleasing to Massachusetts, for when I am deported from Montana they will have to deport me to Massachusetts, because that is where I was born.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Maryland suggests, as I understood him—what was the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. TYDINGS. I thought the Senator said he understood it. I should like to hear what he understood.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought I understood it, but really I did not.

Mr. TYDINGS. Well, what did the Senator understand?

Mr. SMOOT. What was the last statement the Senator made?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator got up to criticize something, and I want to see if he has the statement correct.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not going to criticize anyone; I want to know if I understood what the Senator said.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Utah said that he understood what I said and I am asking him to state what he understood.

Mr. SMOOT. I said I did not understand, and that is the reason I ask the Senator to repeat it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I said if the Senator from Montana continued to orate in the manner of his utterances here this morning that soon he might be deported to Russia as a communist.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not understand the Senator. I might add, though, that if the Senator from Montana is going to continue as he has, after a while I should think he would have to establish in Montana a horse-racing track and make money in that way instead of from industries protected by tariff duties.

Mr. WHEELER. I am very fond of horse racing, I will say to the Senator from Utah, and I have not come to the point where I am afraid to confess that I am.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Montana should be commended, for he has been very consistent. He deported himself from Massachusetts as a youth when he discovered the intolerable conditions there which he has described and, unless I am mistaken, he has kept away from Massachusetts. I think he is to be commended for his consistency.

Mr. WHEELER. I have not any doubt but that many people in Massachusetts would not only like to see me keep away but some of them would like to see others leave there, as I did.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. On the contrary, we have a great deal of affection for the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, coming back to this bill, I want to repeat what I said a moment ago, that, speaking seriously, I can not, for the life of me, understand how the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate, in the face of the uncontradicted facts, could possibly recommend higher rates of duty on cotton manufactured goods. I say it is indefensible.

Of course I appreciate what the Senator from Maryland says, that when one stands here on this floor and points out the bunk that is given out to the workmen with reference to the benefits of the tariff to them; when he attempts to expose the selfishness, the crookedness, and the sham, and the hypocrisy of those who are coming here seeking special privileges at the hands of this body, of course he must expect to be condemned and criticized by that class of individuals. But I wish to say to the Senator from Utah, and to the other Senators who are seeking high rates of duties, that that has never yet deterred me from doing what I felt was my duty, and it is not going to deter me now. Neither ridicule nor all of the condemnation that may be heaped upon me is going to prevent me from standing here on this floor and pointing out the iniquities in the cotton-textile schedule and the other schedules of this bill.

The rates proposed are a crime against the American people; they are not for the benefit of the workmen; they are not for the benefit of the farmers of the country. Anyone who thinks this bill is being passed for any such reason is badly mistaken. Anybody who thinks the bill is being passed for that reason or who tells the American farmers that the bill is a bill for his good, in my judgment is misrepresenting the truth and the facts of the case to him; and anybody who tells the great bulk of the American workmen that the bill is being passed in their interest is telling them something that, in my judgment, is not in accordance with the facts.

I want to see, if you please, Mr. President, the Senators on the other side go back to their constituents and tell the wheat farmers how much benefit they are going to derive from this bill; tell the cotton growers of the South how much benefit they are going to obtain from this bill; tell the railroad workers of the country how much they are going to be benefited by this bill; tell the coal miners and the copper miners and the man who works in the street and the man who labors on the construction of factories and houses, the carpenter; tell those men how much they are going to get out of this bill; let them tell the housewives of the country how much they are getting out of this bill. Go back, if you will, and show the profits that have been made and how, since the 1922 tariff act was passed, the textile mill owners have lowered the wages of

the workingman in that industry; how they increased his hours of work; and tell them also how they not only doubled and trebled but quadrupled the amount of work that he had to do.

No, Mr. President, when the Republicans go back to the farmers in Kansas and Iowa and Illinois they will not tell the workingman or the farmer that; not at all; they will tell him that they voted for a tariff upon cotton textiles in order, if you please, to keep up the American standard of living for the working men; but they will not tell him what those standards were which it was desired to keep up; they will not tell him that it was done because of the fact that those who are asking for these higher rates of duty wanted to keep more children and more women working in the mills at night. Mr. President, they will not tell him, if you please, that the mill operators are only paying in these factories wages of \$9, \$10, \$11, \$12, and \$13 a week. That will be kept in the background.

The Senator from Utah referred to some data which he said he was going to insert in the RECORD. I will ask the Senator with what year do the figures begin?

Mr. SMOOT. I have the figures from 1891, if the Senator wants them.

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator will insert the data in the RECORD showing the incomes of these concerns and the dividends which they have been paying from 1891 to the present

time, I will not take up the time of the Senate by reading more of the figures which I have before me.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that the table to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD. I will ask that it be printed at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Montana and not in the midst of his speech.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See Exhibit A.)

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator has inserted the figures in the RECORD so that we may have some of the facts, I will conclude by repeating what I said at the beginning, that I hope the Senate will not increase the duty on one single item of this schedule which has been reported by the Senate Finance Committee. I hope, before this session is over, that we will reduce some of the tariff rates in the cotton-textile schedule, and I propose, before the bill goes to conference, to offer some amendments reducing some of the high tariff rates. I hope also that the amendment which is now before us will be defeated and that each and every other amendment which has been proposed by the Senate Finance Committee will be defeated, because I say, in all fairness, I do not think that one of the rates which have been recommended can be justified, in view of the showing which has been made, and the facts which have been placed before the Senate of the United States.

EXHIBIT A

Full River cotton mills—Rate of dividends paid during years 1891-1928

[Sources: 1891-1921, G. M. Haffards & Co., Fall River; 1922-1925, Sanford & Kelley, New Bedford, Mass.]

	1891	1892	1893	1894	1895	1896	1897	1898	1899	1900	1901	1902	1903	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908	1909
American Printing Co. ¹																			
American Linen Co.	1	7½	7½	4	7	2½	1	1	4¼	6½	5	8	7½	5½	3	6	11	6	6
Ancona Co. ²																			
Common													(7)						
Preferred																			
Arkwright Mills							(9)	0	0	4½	5½	5	6	5½	3	6	12	6	6
Barnaby Manufacturing Co.	10	10	7	0	0	0	0	1½	6	3	4½	4½	1	6	0	0	0	0	0
Barnard Manufacturing Co.	2½	7	7½	5	7	7	1	0	3¼	8	5½	6	4½	0	2	4½	7	7	6
Border City Manufacturing Co.	8	12	12	7	17½	6½	4	4	6	58	6½	6	6	3½	3½	9½	23½	6	6
Bourne Mills	12	16	12	12	24	12	18	8	10	14	6½	12½	49½	3½	3	4	5	4½	5
Chace Mills	4½	7½	9	6	6	6½	3½	0	6	6	6	6	7	3	4	6	39½	8	8
Conanicut Mills	6½	8	8	5½	6½	6½	0	0	6	8	8	8	7	5	1	4½	6	5	6
Cornell Mills	0	0	4½	6	6	8	7	5	12½	13	6½	7	6½	4	4½	12½	16	11	18
Davis Mills											(7)	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	6
Davol Mills	6	6	6	6	6	6	4½	4	5½	8	6½	6	6	4	1	6	31	6	6
Fall River Manufactory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(7)					
Flint Mills	6	9½	8	8	8	8	6½	4	6	8	7	6	6	4	4	6½	12	8	6
Granite Mills	12	16	9	4½	6½	7	2	1	6	8	8	8	8	6	4½	8½	10	8	8
Hargraves Mills	6	6	6	6½	6½	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	5½	2	0	1	5½	6	7
King Philip Mills	7	7	6	6	6	6	6	4½	7½	56	6	16	6	6	6	56	6	6	6
Laurel Lake Mills	5	6½	7½	5½	6	5½	0	0	3¼	6	4½	6	8	5½	5½	11	114	13	8
Lincoln Manufacturing Co.																	(7)	0	0
Luther Manufacturing Co. ¹⁰	1	3	4½	0	4½	4½	0	0	3	6	1½	0	(11)	0	0	0	0	3	6
Mechanics Mills	0	6	7½	4	6½	7	3	0	5	6	5	4½	4	3	1	4	7	6½	6
Mechanics Manufacturing Co.	6	7	9	6	7	6	2	0	1	6	2½	4	4	2	2	4	55½	6	6
Narragansett Mills	5	5	7½	4	7	6½	5	1	5	8	5½	6	6	5	4	8	11½	8	8
Osborn Mills	6	7	8	7	7	7	4	0	5	33½	3½	4	4	3	2	4	5½	6	6
Parker Mills				(7)	3½	3½	5	5½	6½	6	8	8	7	3	0	1	5½	6	7
Pocasset Manufacturing Co.	2	6	7	5	6	4½	1	0	4½	6	6	6	6	4½	6	6	116	6	6
Richard Borden Manufacturing Co.	4	6	7	3½	7	5½	3	3	7½	9	6½	6	6	5½	5½	6½	45	13	8
Sagamore Manufacturing Co.	4½	8½	10	6	25½	5	1	0	5½	9	5	7½	4½	4	5	20	30	12	8
Seaconnet Mills	5	8	10½	6½	6½	5½	3½	6	7	5	5	5	5	1	0	0	1½	4½	6½
Shove Mills	5	7½	9	6½	7	7	3½	0	2½	29½	1½	4	3	0	0	4	4½	6	6
Stafford Mills	4½	7½	11	7	8	8	6	4	14	8	3	4	4	0	1	4	5½	6	6
Stevens Manufacturing Co.		(7)	0	0	2	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	6	4½	5	5½	1½	6
Tecumseh Mills	5	7	7½	6	6½	6½	4	0	5	7½	5	6	6	5½	4½	12	56	14½	6
Troy Cotton & Woolen Manufacturing Co. ¹⁰	40	13	20	17	28	27	15	11	18	27	17	20	16	11	11	20	67	21	113
Union Cotton Manufacturing Co.	12	62	12	10	11	9	6½	6	8½	85	6½	6	6	4½	6	18½	35½	6	29½
Wampanoag Mills	1	5	7	6	8	7	3	0	6	7	2½	4	2	1	0	2	4	4	5
Westmore Mills	0	2	2	0	5½	2½	0	0	4½	6	3½	4	4	2	2	4½	6½	6½	6

	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928
American Printing Co. ¹																			
American Linen Co.	6	2½	1	3	0	1	4½	9	15	10½	24½	6	4	4½	0	0	0	0	0
Ancona Co. ²																			
Common																			
Preferred																			
Arkwright Mills	6	6	6	6	6	4½	4½	9	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	0	(7)		
Barnaby Manufacturing Co.	2½	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	26	25	15½	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barnard Manufacturing Co.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3½	16	16	40	17	161	8	8	6	2	0	0
Border City Manufacturing Co.	6	5	4	4	4	4	5½	28½	15½	14	32	9	58	6	4½	0	0	0	0
Bourne Mills	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	7½	12	14	30	12	12	12	11	7	4½	4	3
Chace Mills	8	6½	4	6	6	6	6½	15	20	13	30	7	6	6	1½	0	0	0	0
Charlton Mills	(7)	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	16	14	30	8	58	8	8	8	8	8	8
Conanicut Mills	6½	4½	4½	6	4	2½	5½	6½	8	10	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(7)
Cornell Mills	18	8	8	8	8	8	8	26	40	22	65	12	71	9	6	5	4	4	0
Davis Mills	6	6	6	6	6	6	8	60½	20	20	63½	6	6	8	6	6	6	4	4
Davol Mills	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	12	12½	14	35	8½	6	16	3	0	0	0	0
Flint Mills	6	3½	3	6	6	6	11½	20	24	16	48	10	58	10	8	5	6	6	6
Granite Mills	8	5½	3	4½	1	1	6	35½	15½	13	27	6½	6	6	0	0	0	0	0
Hargraves Mills	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	5½	7½	9	116½	(19)							

Footnotes at end of table.

Fall River cotton mills—Rate of dividends paid during years 1891-1928—Continued

	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928
King Philip Mills.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	9½	19	16	13	¹⁸ 123	6½	31	31	6	26	16	16	16
Laurel Lake Mills.....	8	6	5	6	3½	1	7	11½	17	14	28	1½	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lincoln Manufacturing Co.....	0	6	6	4½	0	1½	6	¹⁸ 40½	14	15½	30	8½	¹¹ 48	8	6½	1½	0	0	0
Luther Manufacturing Co. ¹⁹	7	6	6	⁸ 74½	6	6½	16	22	18	16	33	8	8	18	8	8	8	8	8
Mechanics Mills.....	6	4½	4	4	4	4	6	13½	17	14	28	8	8	8	8	0	(?)	4	0
Merchants Mfg. Co.....	6	2½	3	4	4	5	7	⁶ 41	20	14	31	9	8	8	6½	4	4	0	0
Narragansett Mills.....	8	6½	4	4	4	3	5½	12½	20	15	35	⁸ 60	7	6	1½	0	0	0	0
Osborn Mills.....	6	6	6	6	6	4	6½	13½	16½	15	31	7½	6	6	0	0	0	(1)	0
Parker Mills.....	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	5½	7½	9	⁸ 116½	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pilgrim Mills:																			
Common.....	(?)	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	14	21	19½	8	4	8	²³ 79½	10	8	20	8
Preferred.....	(?)	0	0	6	6	4½	14	8	8	8	9½	8	6	8	1	0	0	0	0
Pocasset Manufacturing Co.....	6	4	4½	6	2½	1	5½	7½	15	12	25	1½	6	6	1	0	0	0	0
Richard Borden Manufacturing Co.....	10	7	6	6	8½	7½	11	35	20	12	31½	9	8	8	6½	4½	2	0	0
Sagamore Manufacturing Co.....	8	7	6½	10½	10	10	20	⁸ 90	40	25	40	35	²⁴ 86½	14	20	11	8	8	8
Seaconnet Mills.....	6½	0	1	4	2	0	1	5½	13½	16	¹³ 120	4½	2	0	0	0	0	(35)	0
Shawmut Manufacturing Co.:																			
Common.....								(?)	4	10	8	6	6	6	6	6	5½	1	0
Preferred.....								(?)	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	0	0
Shove Mills.....	6	4	3	4	4½	4	5½	⁸ 56½	15	14	⁸ 83	4½	6	6	3½	0	0	0	0
Stafford Mills.....	6	1½	2	4	2	0	1	9	17½	15	25½	9	6	6	0	0	0	0	0
Stevens Manufacturing Co.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	²⁸ 77½	6	9	9	14	8½	10	9	5½	6	6	6	6
Tecumseh Mills.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	9½	19	16	14	²⁰ 73	8	6	6	²⁷ 76½				
Troy Cotton & Woolen Manufacturing Co. ¹³	12	8½	8	8	8	8	8	8	11	10	14	8	8	2	0	0	0	0	0
Union Cotton Manufacturing Co.....	6	6	6	56	6	6	36	16	40	14	54	12	⁸ 91	8	6	6	6	6	8
Wampanoag Mills.....	6	1½	3	4	3	0	3½	6	13	14	36	9	¹ 41½	8	6	0	0	0	0
Weetamoe Mills.....	6	2½	4½	6	4	3	6½	15	26	15	33	6½	6	6	2½	0	0	0	0

¹ Dividends not made public.² Incorporated.³ 30 per cent stock dividend included.⁴ 20 per cent stock dividend included.⁵ 33½ per cent stock dividend included.⁶ 25 per cent stock dividend included.⁷ In 1904 sold to Pocasset Manufacturing Co.⁸ 50 per cent stock dividend included.⁹ 60 per cent stock dividend included.¹⁰ Prior to reorganization in 1903, this plant was known as the Robeson.¹¹ Reorganized.¹² 75 per cent stock dividend included.¹³ Par value \$500 per share. (In case of all other mills shown the par value is \$100 per share.)¹⁴ Foreclosed.¹⁵ 122½ per cent stock dividend included.¹⁶ Sold. As Shawmut Manufacturing Co. now makes yarns only.¹⁷ 150 per cent stock dividend included.¹⁸ 100 per cent stock dividend included.¹⁹ Sold to Parker Mills.²⁰ 50 per cent Liberty bond dividend.²¹ 40 per cent stock dividend included.²² Sold to Weetamoe.²³ 71½ per cent stock dividend included.²⁴ 66½ per cent stock dividend included.²⁵ Sold at auction.²⁶ 71½ per cent stock dividend included.²⁷ 75 per cent liquidating dividend included. In 1924 the Tecumseh Mills were consolidated with the Davol Mills.

New Bedford Cotton Mills, rate of dividends paid during years 1891-1928

[Source: Sanford & Kelley, New Bedford, Mass.]

	1891	1892	1893	1894	1895	1896	1897	1898	1899	1900	1901	1902	1903	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908	1909
Acushnet Mills Corp.....	10	10	16	16	16	16	16	12	16	20	16	16	16	16	16	16	66	16	16
Beacon Mfg. Company:																			
Common.....						(1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	6	6	7½
Preferred.....															6	6	6	6	6
Booth Mfg. Co.:																			
Common.....																			
Preferred.....																			
Bristol Manufacturing Co.....		(1)	0	4½	6	6	5	0	4½	6½	5½	2	4	2	0	2½	6	6	6
Butler Mill, common.....												(1)	0	0	0	5	8	8	9
City Manufacturing Co.....		8	7½	0	4	6	3	3	6½	8	8	8½	10	8½	9	14	25	18	16
Dartmouth Manufacturing Co., common.....					(1)	0	0	0	4½	10	12	8	8	8	20	26	66	66	² 112
Grinnell Manufacturing Co., common.....	12	12	12	12	12	12	9	6	10	85	24½	6	6	6	6	12	8	8	8
Gosnold Mills:																			
Common.....												(1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Preferred.....												(1)	0	0	0	15	15	6	6
Hathaway Manufacturing Co.....	6	6	6	6	7	10	10	7½	10	12½	10	10	10	10	10	10	40	10	10
Holmes Manufacturing Co.:																			
Common.....																			(1)
Preferred.....																			(1)
Kilburn Mills.....														(1)	0	0	4½	6	6
Manomet Mills.....																			8
Nashawena Mills.....													(1)	0	0	5	8	8	(1)
N. B. Cotton Mills, common.....																			(1)
Nonquitt Spinning Co.....																(1)	0	4½	8
Page Manufacturing Co.....																(1)	0	1½	5
Pierce Manufacturing Co.....		(1)	0	4½	6	6	6	4½	7	8	8	8	8	8	9	27	32	16	16
Potomaska Mills.....	6	6	6	5	6	6	0	0	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Soule Mill.....											(1)	0	0	0	2	8	8	8	28
Taber Mill.....																(1)	0	0	0
Wamsutta Mills.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	4½	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	11	6	6
Whitman Mills Corporation.....					(1)	0	0	0	6	7	6½	8	8	7	6	8	8	(1)	42½

	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928
Acushnet Mills Corp.....	16	8	8	8	8	8	18	⁸ 66½	16	6	26	8	⁴ 41½	7	6	6	6	6	1½
Beacon Mfg. Company:																			
Common.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	⁸ 206	6	6	6	6	6	6
Preferred.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Booth Mfg. Co.:																			
Common.....	(1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	8	8	8	8	8	0	0	0
Preferred.....	(1)	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	25½	9	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	1½
Bristol Manufacturing Co.....	6	5	1	0	0	1½	5	5½	11½	12	14	8	10	12	9	12	8½	6	4
Butler Mill:																			
Common.....	28	8	8	4½	1½	0	3	6	6	12	23	8	8	8	8	8	2	0	0
Preferred.....			(1)	1½	7	7	7	7	7	5½	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
City Manufacturing Co.....	16	9½	1½	4	4	0	6	12½	18	18	23	8	8	8	8	8	6½	6	3

Footnotes at end of table.

New Bedford Cotton Mills, rate of dividends paid during years 1891-1928—Continued

	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928
Dartmouth Manufacturing Co.:																			
Common	16	16	16	49½	10	10	20½	42	12	14	34	32	116	9	8	8	8	6	6
Preferred	(7)	5	5	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Fairhaven Mills:																			
Common							(1)	4½	6½	8	16	10	6	3	0	0	0	0	0
Preferred							(1)	4½	6	6	6	6	6	4½	0	0	0	0	0
Grinnell Manufacturing Co., common	8	8	8	8	8	107	10	16	16	16	20	6	8	10	6	6	3	4½	1½
Gosnold Mills:																			
Common	6	6	0	0	0	0	1½	6	7½	8	11	8	8	8	3½	0	0	0	0
Preferred	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	3	0	0
Hathaway Manufacturing Co.	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	120	16	6	26	8	33	7	6	6	6	6	1½
Holmes Manufacturing Co.:																			
Common	0	0	0	3½	6	6	20	22	19	20	38	20	20	18	9½	6	4	0	0
Preferred	0	6	7½	7½	6	6	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	6	6	3	0
Kilburn Mills	39½	6	6	6	6	6	6	8	20	20	15	8	58	8	8	8	8	6½	5
Manomet Mills	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	12	16	16	79½	9	7	3	0	0	0	0	(10)
Nashawena Mills	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	14	16	16	8	8	41½	8	8	7	4½	1½
N. B. Cotton Mills:																			
Common	(11)	(11)	(11)	(11)	(11)	(11)	(11)	(11)	(11)	(11)	(11)	(11)	200	(11)	(11)	(11)	(11)	(11)	(11)
Preferred	(7)	6	6	6	6	18	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Neild Manufacturing Co.	(1)	0	0	4½	5	5½	8½	18	19	20	32	20	90	14	12	12	12	12	9
Nonquitt Spinning Co.	5½	6	6	6	4½	4½	6½	13	16	16	112	8	4½	6	1½	0	0	0	0
Page Manufacturing Co.	22	24	24	16	16	16	16	41	41	41	50	34	50	32	32	32	32	32	26
Pierce Manufacturing Co.	6	6	6	6	6	26	6	13½	12	13	25	8	58	31	6	6	0	0	0
Potomaska Mills:																			
Common	(1)	0	0	1½	6	6	7½	28	28	68	28	8	118	8	8	8	8	8	8
Preferred	(7)	0	4½	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Sharp Manufacturing Co.:																			
Common	(1)	0	0	0	0	4½	6	86	8½	10	16	10	8	2	0	0	0	0	0
Preferred	(7)	0	1½	6	6	6	6	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Soule Mill	8	4½	0	0	0	0	4	6	8½	10	18	18	38	8	8	38	8	28	8
Taber Mill	6	6	1½	6	6	6	6	15	15½	12½	22	8	41½	8	7	6	6	6	1½
Wamsutta Mills	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	12	15½	10	18	8	58	6	6	6	5	4	2
Whitman Mills Corporation	10	9½	6	6	6	6	6½	16	16	20	33	13	62	11½	9½	6½	3	0	0

* Organized.

* 100 per cent stock dividend included.

* Issued.

* 23½ per cent stock dividend included.

* 50 per cent stock dividend included.

* 200 per cent stock dividend included.

* Retired.

* 25 per cent stock dividend included.

* 60 per cent stock dividend included.

* Liquidated.

* Dividends not made public.

* Not published.

* Sold to Gosnold Mills Co.

* 75 per cent stock dividend included.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should be glad to have the Senate take a vote on this amendment, but before the vote shall be taken I want to call attention to a few facts.

This amendment provides a minimum specific on unbleached cotton cloth made dutiable under paragraph 904 (a). With much of the argument which the Senator from Montana has made, I am in the completest sympathy; but I want my position to be understood. I realize that this amendment does increase the average protection given to unbleached cotton cloth; indeed, the average protection is increased about one and a quarter points over the protection given by the House bill to the goods coming under paragraph 904 (a).

The Senator from Montana has quite forcefully pointed out that the total importations of cotton cloth in 1928, for instance, amounted only to \$15,363,796. The importations of unbleached cotton cloth amounted to \$4,742,536, or 30.77 per cent of the total importations. The importations of bleached cotton cloth amounted to \$2,174,010, or 14.15 per cent of the total importations. The importations of colored cotton cloth amounted to \$5,630,341, or 36.65 per cent of the importations. The importations of "cotton cloth woven with eight or more harnesses" and with two or more kinds of filling; that is, cloth coming under subsection (d) of paragraph 904, amounted, respectively, to \$2,695,244 and \$121,665, and the percentages of the whole importations for 1928 were, respectively, 17.64 and 0.79.

Mr. President, while the importations of all cotton cloths are less than 1 per cent of the total domestic consumption, it is to be borne in mind that the importations may press especially against particular production. That is to say, the importations may be largely of a particular kind of cloth, produced by a few manufacturers in the United States.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. GEORGE. I do.

Mr. WHEELER. That may be true; but, taken as a whole, as Mr. Shipley pointed out, that does not amount to anything at all. It may be that there are one or two instances where they are importing some goods; but when they have an embargo on everything else, why should we go to work and try to stop up every little loophole for these manufacturers, under the circumstances that have been portrayed?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator and I are not in disagreement; but let me proceed. The Senator will find if he will go into the woolen schedule, for instance, that we are supplying 96 per

cent—perhaps more, but 96 per cent certainly—of domestic consumption. That is, our mills are making 96 per cent of all the woolen goods consumed in America, so that only 4 per cent is getting away from us; and, of course, the trouble with the woolen industry is not lack of tariffs. That is obvious; nor is the trouble with the cotton industry lack of tariffs. That is obvious, and I do not dispute it. As long as the tariff is maintained, however, the justification for this particular amendment, in my opinion, is to give to the producers of all classes of cotton goods something like equality in protection.

The Senator is quite right in saying that when we look at the industry as a whole there is no excuse for any increase in duty, and I do not advocate that. I do not advocate it now. I want to say to the Senator that the House increased the duty on yarns. In other words, they went back to the first paragraph in the cotton schedule and increased yarns, and, of course, then they came down in the next paragraph and increased the duty on sewing threads, and the Senate committee did not interfere with the increases made in the yarn schedule. They did recommend an increase in the duties given to the thread manufacturers, and last night we rejected the Senate committee amendment. The House rearranged paragraph 904. That is to say, the House took cloths under paragraphs 903, 905, and 906 of the act of 1922 and reclassified them under paragraph 904 as the several subparagraphs of that paragraph. The House increased the duty over the act of 1922 on these cloths. That I believe to be wholly unjustified, and I agree with the Senator that there should not be any increase, and I do not assert that there should not be a decrease; but for the time being paragraph 904 (a) has been amended by the Senate Finance Committee only by adding this proviso. There was another amendment which we have already rejected, and the effect of that amendment was to carry over a certain class of merchandise into two other paragraphs of this same paragraph at a higher rate; but we have rejected that, so this provision is the only Senate committee amendment that remains in paragraph 904.

Now I call the attention of the Senator from Montana and of the Senate to the fact that starting with unbleached cotton cloth No. 16 and running up to No. 90—having reference, of course, to the yarns—it will be found that a lower rate of duty is imposed under the House bill than under the act of 1922. In other words, starting at 16s, but not running regularly, because 17s, for instance, are not affected—that is on the basis of the importations of a particular year, and I am using 1927—taking the 1927 importations of unbleached cloth, it will be found that

cloths of No. 16s was dutiable under the present law at 18.13 per cent, while under the House bill without this proviso the same cloth was dutiable at 15.60 per cent; and then taking 16s, 22s, 25s, 26s, 27s, 28s, 29s, and so forth, up to 90s, it will be found that the total protection given to cloths made of these numbers amounted to 32.55 per cent under the present law, but the total protection given to these same cloths, based on the importations of 1927, under the House bill amounts to only 30.58 per cent; in other words, nearly 2 per cent less protection upon cloths of these particular numbers.

This proviso stands upon this basis of justification: If protection is to be given to cotton cloths at all, it ought to be as nearly equitable and uniform among the several classes of cotton cloths as possible; that is, the cloths based upon these several numbers. This proviso would bring that about. I am frank to say to the Senator that it would a little more than bring that about. It would have the effect in some instances of giving these low-value cloths of a higher ad valorem than other related cloths, and a higher ad valorem than they have under the present law.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. GEORGE. I do.

Mr. WHEELER. That being so, then the others would come in and say, "We want an increase equal to that," and they would be entitled to it. If the Senator's argument is correct, they would be entitled to have their increase up to the one fixed in this proviso.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is correct. I am pointing that out, however, in order to present what I believe to be the true picture here; but that would be true, perhaps, only in a few instances of a very low price.

My opinion is that to this proviso there should be added a provision that this rate shall not apply when the duty is greater than 45 per cent ad valorem, say, or 50 per cent ad valorem, say, so as really to make this section uniform.

Mr. President, I think this provision ought to be adopted; but, inasmuch as it will go to conference, I very much hope that if it is adopted, the difficulty that I have pointed out, and which the Senator from Montana has indicated, will be ironed out in conference.

I want to say to the Senator that there has been an increase in the protection given to yarn. There has been an increase in the protection given to cloth, not only unbleached but bleached, dyed, and so forth. I think the duties ought not to be increased as the House increased them. I think there should be a reduction in the rates. I believe, however, that this provision should be adopted, particularly if the incongruous results are to be ironed out in conference, because of the fact that there is considerable pressure of imports upon the particular cloths that get relatively less protection under the House bill than they do under the act of 1922. In other words, we must always bear in mind that while the importations are small, nevertheless those importations may press almost entirely upon the production of a particular grade of cloth in the United States.

I have no disagreement with the Senator from Montana in his main position, and that is that the increases given in yarns and in cloths by the House, in my opinion, are not justified. Certain Senate committee increases here are not justified; but, for the most part, if these duties are to be dealt with in a proper way, we shall have to do so when the bill is ripe for individual amendments, because, with respect to unbleached cloth, the Senate Finance Committee has not touched the rate fixed by the House. It has simply contented itself with adding this proviso, which, while, perhaps, not perfect and not perfectly adjusted, does remedy a situation that ought not to be allowed to exist; but the rate itself, when fixed, in my judgment, ought to be less than the rate carried in this paragraph.

Mr. President, I do not wish to consume the time of the Senate. That is the basis upon which I think this amendment can be adopted, and, in my opinion, it is the only justifiable basis on which this amendment ought to be allowed to stay in the bill.

I desire to take this occasion to say that it seems to me that the other increases made by the Senate committee in the subparagraphs of this particular paragraph should be rejected. There may be some exception to that general statement; but, so far as I now recall, all of the other changes made in the subparagraphs of paragraph 904 ought to be rejected.

Mr. WHEELER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Fess	Jones	Sheppard
Ashurst	Fletcher	Kean	Shortridge
Barkley	Frazier	Kendrick	Simmons
Bingham	George	Keyes	Smoot
Black	Gillett	La Follette	Steck
Blaine	Glass	McCulloch	Stelwer
Blease	Glenn	McKellar	Stephens
Borah	Goff	McMaster	Swanson
Bratton	Goldsborough	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Brook	Greene	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Hale	Norbeck	Townsend
Broussard	Harris	Norris	Trammell
Capper	Harrison	Nye	Tydings
Caraway	Hastings	Oddie	Vandenberg
Connally	Hatfield	Overman	Wagner
Copeland	Hawes	Patterson	Walcott
Couzens	Hayden	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Cutting	Hebert	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Hedin	Robinson, Ind.	Waterman
Deneen	Howell	Sackett	Wheeler
Dill	Johnson	Schall	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 153, line 11, where the committee, in the clause for cotton cloth, printed, dyed, or colored, proposed to strike out "16 per cent" and insert in lieu thereof "20 per cent."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I hope the chairman of the Committee on Finance will not insist upon this amendment. Obviously, the Senate committee amendment here proposed, increasing 16 per cent to 20 per cent ad valorem, was for the purpose of restoring the protection of 4 per cent ad valorem given in the act of 1922 to vat-dyed cloth. In 1922 there was some reason for giving an additional duty to vat-dyed cloth, perhaps, but in view of the cheapness of dyes in this country now, in view of the changed conditions brought about in the dyeing industry, it does not look reasonable that this protection should be continued, even if it were continued for vat-dyed goods, the form in which the committee has proposed the amendment gives an additional 4 per cent protection on all printed or dyed or otherwise colored goods; in other words, the 4 per cent now covers a hundred per cent of colored cloth, whereas it covered under the 1922 act only about 10 per cent; that is, the vat-dyed cloth constituted about 10 per cent. I think this amendment ought to be rejected.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think the statement of the Senator is virtually correct as to the rate. It is true that in the act of 1922 there was provision made imposing a 4 per cent duty on all vat-dyed goods. It is also true, as the Senator has said, that that applies to the committee amendment on line 14, raising the duty from 47½ to 51½ per cent. I think the Senator has made a fair statement.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, do I understand that the Senator from Utah is going to insist upon this amendment of the Finance Committee?

Mr. SMOOT. I am not going to insist on a vote.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. WHEELER. If there is going to be any question about it, I shall ask for a roll call on it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If the Senator from Montana had heard the Senator from Utah distinctly, he would have realized that, as chairman of the Committee on Finance, he could not any more plainly have said, "I hope the amendment will be rejected."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if there is going to be any doubt about any more of these increases in the textile schedule, I shall ask for a roll call on every amendment. I want the coalition, so to speak, to go on record, as long as they are responsible for the bill, because I want to say right now that I am not a part of the coalition when it comes to voting for the raising of the rates in this cotton schedule, because they are the most unconscionable raises in the whole bill.

If the so-called coalitionists are going to approve these raises, are going to vote for them, then they can count me out of it, because the cotton schedule has reeked with corruption at practically every session of Congress when we have had a tariff bill under consideration, and it was not without its scandal in connection with the pending bill.

Mr. President, if there is going to be any doubt about any of these raises, let us have a record vote on each amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I will ask for a record vote in any case where I think it is necessary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on line 14, to strike out "47½ per cent" and to insert in lieu thereof "51½ per cent."

Mr. GEORGE. The same situation exists as to that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 153, after line 22, to insert:

(e) In further addition to the foregoing duty or duties provided in this paragraph for cotton cloth, there shall be paid the following duties, namely: On cotton cloth finished with a permanent crispness, resiliency, and translucency, such as and including cloth commercially known as permanent finished organdie, 10 per cent ad valorem; on cotton cloth woven with printed or stamped warp yarn or threads, 25 per cent ad valorem; on cotton cloth printed by the surface or relief method, as distinguished from the engraved or intaglio method, 10 per cent ad valorem.

(f) In no case shall the foregoing duty or duties imposed upon cotton cloth in this paragraph be less than 5 cents per pound.

(g) Tire fabric or fabric for use in pneumatic tires, including cord fabric, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, undoubtedly other Senators have received a copy of the communication I have in my hand, from the National Council of American Importers and Traders, of New York City, dated October 11. The letter reads:

We believe that the Republican majority of the Senate Finance Committee fail to appreciate the great duty increase in printed-cotton goods, particularly warp prints under paragraph 904 (e), and we are taking the opportunity of sending you herewith a card showing six illustrations of warp prints, and how enormous the increases are, compared to the present tariff—wholly unjustifiable.

These cotton goods are common, ordinary, everyday materials, costing from 30 cents per yard on the other side, used by the American housewife of moderate means. They seem to have been singled out for an advance greater than the advances granted on silk, wool, or on rayon fabrics.

American manufacturers are amply protected already under the present law, and we are convinced that after you have examined these exhibits you will realize that there is surely no necessity for such an extraordinary advance. On one fabric there can be as many as six different calculations required in assessing rates of duty.

May we ask your study of this matter.

The card attached refers to different exhibits. Exhibit No. A, for instance, is a sample of yarn No. 9. The foreign cost is 57 cents. One column shows the compound rates in the pending bill to be 33.1 per cent; the increase over present duty, 90 per cent.

The next is warp print B, yarn No. 9. The increase over the present duty is 223 per cent.

The next is warp print C, yarn No. 16. The increase over the present duty is 150 per cent.

The next is warp print D, yarn No. 20. The increase over the present duty is 142 per cent.

The next is warp print E, yarn No. 20. The increase over the present duty is 220 per cent.

The next is warp print F, yarn No. 24. The increase over the present duty is 180 per cent.

The increases to which I have referred are increases over the duties in the present law which would result from the adoption of the rates proposed in the pending bill. The notation states:

Rate of duties for printed, dyed, or colored cotton cloth, 20 per cent ad valorem, and, in addition thereto for each yarn number, 0.35 of 1 per cent ad valorem. In addition, 25 per cent ad valorem for printed warps. Also an additional 10 per cent for surface prints. Again another 5 per cent ad valorem when two or more colors or kinds of filling. Also in addition when woven with eight or more harnesses, or with Jacquard, lappet, or swivel, 10 per cent ad valorem.

I can not put in the RECORD these samples, but giving the numbers and the increases proposed would seem to indicate a very considerable increase over present rates.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to make a brief statement. This is virtually a new industry in the United States. I think the letter read by the Senator hardly gives the facts in the case. I had not intended to say anything, but I do feel that I should call this fact to the attention of the Senate.

The domestic finishing industry experiences keen competition from abroad in the permanent finishing of organdies, the preparation of yarn for the weaving of warp-print fabrics, and the finishing of clothing by surface printing.

The permanent finished organdies which bulk large in our imports are generally gray cloths from England which are

finished in Switzerland. The finish is permanent to washing. It requires special apparatus, with the use of highly concentrated acid, and the cost is much greater than that for the common starched finishes, not permanent, applied to lawns in general. Several domestic plants are successfully applying the permanent finish in the bleach, piece-dyed, or printed, and of a quality equal to that of the imported cloths. Two domestic plants are employing, under license from the Swiss owners, the identical formulæ and processes used abroad.

That fact is demonstrated beyond question of doubt because England herself had to ship the cloth in the gray to Switzerland and have it finished in Switzerland. It is under a patented process. All of these organdies are finished under that process in Switzerland. There is an ample capacity in the domestic industry to supply the domestic demand and in view of the relatively large imports in this line the committee advised the additional protection.

In other words, there are over 10,000,000 square yards of this one class of organdie cloth coming into the United States at present. That is the condition existing. That is why the Senate committee made the change. That is all I am going to say about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator why the Senate committee found it necessary or advisable, after specifying in the previous subsections of the paragraph the ad valorem and specific duties that the items were to carry, to add a new paragraph providing that in addition to all those rates the following duties shall be applied, carrying 10 per cent on organdie, 25 per cent on cotton cloth woven with printed or stamped warp yarn or threads, and so forth. In other words, after fixing the rate in the previous paragraph the committee comes along with an omnibus provision that in addition to all the other duties, 10 per cent and 25 per cent more shall be added.

Mr. SMOOT. I have just explained why it was done. It applies to organdies. It is virtually a new industry in the United States. The competition, of course, is very keen upon that one line of cotton goods.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, organdie had been coming in long before the new industry was established. Organdie for generations has been a well-recognized element in the making of ladies' dresses.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Now, the question is whether we are going to increase the tariff more than it has been simply because somebody here thinks it necessary in order to manufacture this new product of American cotton.

Mr. SMOOT. The only justification no doubt that they have is that there is a Swiss patent which is now being used on these organdies. I called attention to the fact that even England herself does not try to do the finishing of the organdies now, but ships them in the gray direct to Switzerland and pays Switzerland for finishing the organdies under the process which has been patented by Switzerland. That is the whole story, and if the Senate does not want to protect the industry, all we have to do is disagree to the committee amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no doubt that this will increase the price of organdies to women all over the United States. As organdie is used very largely by women in all classes of life in dresses, particularly for summer wear, I personally do not think the increase is justified and I shall vote against it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I want to suggest that the present duties are high on all these commodities, and what I can not understand is why we should increase some of them 150 per cent.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, if I understood the Senator from Utah, chairman of the Finance Committee, he is justifying this increase solely upon the fact that we are using a Swiss patent and that we have to pay for the use of that patent. I suppose we have the same machinery that is used in Switzerland, but we have to pay for the use of the patent.

Mr. SMOOT. That is correct.

Mr. SIMMONS. I would like to ask the Senator if he has any information which would indicate that the cost of the use of the patent amounts to the increase he is asking?

Mr. SMOOT. The only information the committee had was the testimony of the parties who appeared here, who are interested in producing these organdies in the United States. I asked the Tariff Commission if they had made an investigation of it and they said no; that they did not know what it cost. Therefore I can not tell the Senator what it cost. The only evidence the committee had tended to show that they should have a 10 per cent protection.

Mr. SIMMONS. It seems to me the mill people asking the increase might have furnished the committee with some definite evidence to show the cost of the permits. That is all it is,

a permit to use the patent. Certainly, the cost of that permit would not seem to justify the increase in the absence of some testimony to that effect. That is the sole ground upon which the Senator seems to base the request for the increase. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. SACKETT] probably was present at the time this matter was discussed in the subcommittee and may have some information upon the subject. I do not remember having been there myself.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. On this matter I wish to make this very brief statement: These organdies are imported primarily, if not exclusively, from Switzerland.

Mr. SMOOT. Those from England, of course, come through Switzerland. Most of them come from Switzerland, but the English goods are sent to Switzerland for finishing.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. The finishing is supposed to result from some chemical process. Whether that supposition is correct or not I do not know. If that be true, of course there is not much additional labor involved and can not be. Of course, Swiss manufacturers have control of the process through control of their patent, but it is claimed that there has been a rather large volume of importations. On the contrary, there is information to the effect that the importations are not increasing. It is also claimed that the importations are due to the superior quality of the Swiss organdies.

At any rate, I call attention to the fact that under the act of 1922 bleached cloth was dutiable at 33 per cent and bleached organdie fell under the same paragraph and was dutiable at 33 per cent. Under the House provision organdie is dutiable at 44.5 per cent and under the Senate Finance Committee amendment it is increased to 54.5 per cent. Printed organdie was dutiable under the act of 1922 at 40 per cent and under the House provision it is made dutiable at 47.5 per cent. Under the Senate Finance Committee amendment it is made dutiable at 61.5 per cent. I do not see how these enormous increases in duty can be justified.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, may I suggest, in order to save time and as a compromise, that the Finance Committee amendment be reduced one-half? On the evidence here presented there is undoubtedly a great volume of these goods imported. It is a question whether they are not of superior quality. I am willing to give the benefit of the doubt and to agree to the compromise by a reduction of the rate one-half.

Mr. SMOOT. They could not be of a better quality. The same yarn is used in the manufacture of the cloth in Switzerland or England or the United States. There may be a difference in design. In this process the warp is printed and the weaving of it then forms the pattern in the cloth as it is woven.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think that is correct.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly satisfied to cut it in two.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Let us have that done.

Mr. SACKETT. Mr. President, before we go to a vote on this question I would like to say that before the Finance Committee there was a graph presented showing the imports of the different counts of yarn and on that graph there was this organdie number, which is a particular number, from which the organdies are made. That one line on the graph stretched practically across the page and none of the others showed up materially. Then the Association of Finishers filed a brief before the committee which has a very short paragraph in relation to organdies. The brief was filed under oath, and it says:

It is estimated that at least 16,000,000 square yards of this fabric were imported into America in 1928, while the total production by American finishers would hardly be 8,000,000 yards.

About one-half is produced in this country of the amount that is imported.

The imported cloth seems to be coming in in still greater volume than ever before.

A comparison of the wholesale prices on the imported organdies in the permanent finish and on domestic gray goods in the same finish is as follows:

Imported Swiss organdies

Width	Count	Yarns	Price per yard
			<i>Cents</i>
45 inches	88 by 84	80/120	28½
45 inches	86 by 74	80/120	27½
45 inches	88 by 84	80/120	27½
45 inches	87 by 22	80/120	27

Domestic organdies

Width	Count	Yarns	Price per yard
			<i>Cents</i>
40 inches	84 by 80	90/110	30
40 inches	84 by 80	90/110	27
40 inches	84 by 80	90/110	27½

The above prices were obtained from three different sources. The imported fabric is 45 inches wide and the domestic is 40 inches wide, and this is true of nearly all of the imported organdies. Therefore, the actual difference between the 45-inch and the 40-inch cloth is 12½ per cent.

That is the difference in the wholesale selling price of imported organdies compared with the domestic production, the imported being, according to the statement, 12½ per cent less.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator understand that is the selling price of the Swiss product in this country?

Mr. SACKETT. It is a comparison of the wholesale prices of the imported organdies of permanent finish and of the domestic organdies of the same finish.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator does not have any information as to what is the difference in the cost of production?

Mr. SACKETT. I have nothing except what appears here. Two or three witnesses appeared before the committee and discussed the question of organdies. The most enlightening one was the gentleman who exhibited the graph, as the Senator remembers, in which the imports were shown—and the figures were rather startling—compared with the imports of other cotton goods. Then they filed the list of wholesale selling prices. There must be some reason why the imports of Swiss organdies are so much heavier than the domestic production. The only reason I can assign at all is that the Swiss are able to sell them cheaper, and if they are able to sell them cheaper, as we can make 8,000,000 yards, it seems to me that there was a probability of building up the organdie industry in this country, but that it could not be done unless some degree of protection were afforded to it, because the Swiss product sells cheaper than does the domestic.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator knows that we can not draw any inferences that are satisfactory from the domestic selling price or the foreign selling price in the American market, because very frequently those selling prices bear but very little relation to the cost of production. I understood the Senator from Utah, however—and it was his contention that I wanted enlightenment on from the Senator from Kentucky—agreed to this proposed increase purely and simply upon the ground that we had to lease the patent right from the Swiss. What I was anxious to find out was whether the price which we have to pay for the use of that patent is as great as the proposed increase in the tariff rate.

Mr. SACKETT. I think we have no testimony whatever on that subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Kentucky whether it is true that the habits and tastes of the people may not have as much to do with the purchase of the imported article as the question of price?

Mr. SACKETT. I beg the Senator's pardon. Will he repeat his question.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was asking whether it is not true that the habits and tastes of the women in the purchase and use of the organdies may have as much to do with the large importation as the question of price? For a long time they have been in the habit of purchasing the imported article, and I am informed that the foreign article probably is a little more smooth and more pleasant and is regarded as of better quality. May not that have as much to do with the large importations as the price itself?

Mr. SACKETT. If that is the case and if what the brief which was filed says is true as to the price of the foreign article being 12½ per cent less than the price of the domestic article, I should think the purchasers in this country would still prefer the imported.

Mr. BARKLEY. If that difference in price is simply due to the fact that one is 45 inches in width and the other is 40, the price is practically the same.

Mr. SACKETT. Considering that fact, the price is practically the same.

Mr. BARKLEY. Because the domestic product is wider by 5 inches than the imported that is regarded—

Mr. SACKETT. That affects the relative value.

Mr. BARKLEY. It affects the relative value to the extent of 12½ per cent; but, even so, is it not true that the present duty, which is in the neighborhood of 33½ per cent, is sufficient? Certainly the House duty, which carries the rate to 47½ per cent, ought to be high enough to cover that difference, without the 61½ per cent proposed by the Senate committee amendment.

Mr. SACKETT. It may be that is the case. There are only two concerns, it is stated, in this country that are now licensed by the owners of the Swiss patent for that finish in this country. I grant that may have something to do with the excessive imports. No other concerns being licensed, the production here can not be as much as it could otherwise be.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not understand that there has been any increase in the importations, because if this is a new industry which has been licensed by the owners of the Swiss patent, prior to that arrangement, of course, all of this organdie came in from abroad.

Mr. SACKETT. I do not really know, and I think the testimony that was given before the committee is hardly sufficient for us to be able to tell about that; but it does seem on the face of the statement made that there may be a chance to build up another industry here that will be valuable to the people who may work in it. I think, if this proposal is turned down, some of us ought at least to make an investigation to see what the real facts are before the bill goes into the Senate. It is not anything I am seeking at all; I am simply trying to explain what little we ascertained in the committee on the subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems rather speculative even at best.

Mr. SACKETT. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think it is quite evident to all Senators that there is a real reason for a slight increase of duty. There are about 12,000,000 square yards imported. There are three concerns making this organdie in the United States. Two of them are making it under the Swiss patent, and one of them is trying to make it without the Swiss patent.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. How long has the Swiss patent been in use in this country?

Mr. SMOOT. Not very long.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, how long?

Mr. SMOOT. Between eight and nine years, I think.

Mr. BARKLEY. For what year does the Senator say the importations were 12,000,000 square yards?

Mr. SMOOT. In 1928.

Mr. BARKLEY. How does that compare with the importations for previous years?

Mr. SMOOT. I will tell the Senator. In 1927 the importations were 12,800,000 square yards of the same articles, and in 1926 the importations of these two items were 1,302,000 square yards. So the Senator can see exactly what is going on as to the importations.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems rather strange that the Swiss who manufacture this product should wait until after they get two or three agents located in the United States before they increase their importations here.

Mr. SMOOT. This is a new product.

Mr. SACKETT. The importations, perhaps, depended on the style to some extent.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; the style may very well have had something to do with it. Last year organdies were used widely, as the Senator must know, and that had a great deal to do with the importations.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, due to the change of style, the American manufacturers were not able to supply the demand and there was a sudden call from abroad for this dress material.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not think that is true. I was going to ask why not cut the proposed rate in two, making the 10 per cent 5 per cent and the 25 per cent 12½ per cent, giving the industry a chance, at any rate? Let those rates go to conference and see if it can not be worked out satisfactorily there.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know as much about this item, of course, as some other Senators do; but, so far as I am concerned individually, I am not going to agree to any increase over the House rate.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, am I correctly informed when I state that this industry is chiefly located in the South, there being a mill in South Carolina and a mill in North Carolina and one in Connecticut?

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to inquire what difference does that make.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood there was one mill in Connecticut and one in Massachusetts.

Mr. BINGHAM. The information which we have is that there is one in North Carolina, one in South Carolina, and one in Connecticut.

Mr. BARKLEY. What difference would it make if they were all in California?

Mr. SMOOT. I was mistaken. There is one mill in South Carolina, one in North Carolina, and one in Connecticut.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is about the most definite information we have obtained on the subject since the debate started.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am going to ask the Senator from Georgia if he will not agree to cut the proposed 10 per cent rate to 5 per cent and the proposed 25 per cent rate to 12½ per cent and let it go to conference and see if we can not work it out there.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am very frank to say that I do not see any real reason for a duty on organdies, but inasmuch as the House has not acted on the subject and we have before us simply a Senate committee amendment, I will make no objection to a 5 per cent rate on organdies. The amendment can go to conference, and if there is any industry that might be developed such action can be taken there as may be wise.

I want to state that 5 per cent is a very small duty. The foreign value of this organdie would not be more than from 15 to 18 cents a yard, so that a 5 per cent duty would be not much more than half a cent a yard on it.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope that what I have suggested will be agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think in considering what the fate of this bill is going to be in conference, we ought to keep in mind the fact that any agreement entered into between the House and the Senate conferees must be at some point above the lowest rate fixed by the Senate and below the highest rate fixed by the House, and, assuming that there is an average level of rates in the House bill and in the Senate bill, the compromise which usually transpires in a conference committee will be somewhere between the two. In other words, this bill will have no lower rates in it by any stretch of the imagination than will be carried by the bill as passed by the Senate, and the chances are that the rates will be raised in conference rather than lowered.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the rate now proposed can not be raised. This is a new provision entirely, and all that would go to conference is the amendment upon which we agree, and the rate would have to be determined between that which we fix and nothing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not quite. These organdies are taxed in the body of this section and the tax was raised by the House upon them.

Mr. SMOOT. This is additional to the House provision, and if the House should not agree to the additional tax of 5 per cent, as suggested by the Senator, it would have to go out.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; it would have to go out, and then the rate would be left where the House fixed it, at about 47½ per cent, which is an increase of 14 per cent above the present duty. Of course, we have got to go through this bill again when we reach the consideration of individual amendments. It may then be desirable to offer an amendment to this section reducing the rate fixed by the House, and the Senate ought not to forego the right to do that by adopting the amendment the Senate committee has suggested.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senate should adopt the amendment it could be stricken out in conference, and the House rate could also be reduced.

Mr. GEORGE. We will still have another opportunity, of course, to amend this particular paragraph.

Mr. BARKLEY. We might as well at least do a thorough job while we are at it, so far as the Senate is concerned.

Mr. SIMMONS. We are not doing that as to any part of the bill.

Mr. President, I am disposed to agree to this suggestion, because I think we need some further information with respect to this particular item. That, of course, we can get before the matter is taken up in conference. My understanding now is that there are only three mills in this country that produce this material, and only two of those mills have the advantage of the Swiss patent. The third one does not; and I understand that the third one is in trouble, and probably will have to discontinue business. It is said that one of them is located in North Carolina. I do not know anything about that. It may be the one that is in jeopardy.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I will say to the Senator that it is not.

Mr. SIMMONS. But at least it is of sufficient importance not to foreclose it in the face of the fact that we have not satisfactory information either to justify it or to refuse to approve it.

For that reason I shall consent to the suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, is this vote on the entire amendment or simply on organdie? I made that suggestion only with reference to organdie.

Mr. SMOOT. Then let us agree, on line 3, page 154, to strike out "10 per cent," and in line 7 to strike out "10 per cent," and insert "5 per cent" in each case.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not understand the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. SMOOT. On line 3 strike out "10" and insert "5," so that it will read "5 per cent ad valorem," and on line 7 strike out "10" and insert "5," so that it will read "5 per cent ad valorem" in both cases.

Mr. GEORGE. The last amendment would relate to what—cretonne?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I suggest that we take the first one first—to strike out "10" and insert "5," on line 3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah to the Senate committee amendment on line 3, page 154.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah will not preclude any Member from voting against the whole amendment if it should be carried, will it?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; it certainly will not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly not.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator from Utah that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], who has been temporarily called from the Chamber, desired a roll call on any of these increases in the cotton schedule. The Senator is now in his place. I did not want to forego his right to have a roll call.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to say to the Senator from Montana, now that he is in the Chamber, what I have already said to the Senate.

The question is on the rate on organdie, the very finest kind of cloth made. There are three mills in the United States making it. The importations have increased until now they are over 10,000,000 square yards. One mill is in North Carolina, one mill is in South Carolina, and the other mill is in Connecticut. Two mills, and two mills only, in the United States have the right to use the Swiss patent, and the other mill in America is trying to make organdies here without the Swiss patent. If reports are true, I want to say that they are having very poor success with it.

I do not know that I want to take the time of the Senate to go into the details of what that patent is; but the two mills that are making these fabrics in this country successfully at the present time are the two mills that are using the Swiss patent.

The importations have increased from 1,000,000 square yards in 1925 or 1926 up to 10,000,000 square yards now. These organdies are the finest goods made. The committee reported 10 per cent in addition for organdies; and, as found on page 154, I have asked that the 10 per cent on line 3 be reduced to 5 per cent, and also the 10 per cent on line 7. That is the proposition before the Senate at the present time.

Mr. WHEELER. That is in addition to the rates carried in the body of the section?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, yes; that is in addition to the rates carried in the body of it.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if there is going to be a vote on this matter, let me say to the Senator before the vote is taken that a number of Members on this side of the Chamber are out; and they have suggested to me that they desire to be present when a vote is taken, and want a roll call upon the matter.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator? The vote can be taken on this proposed amendment and the next proposed amendment, and then the question will come on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended. Is not that correct?

Mr. SMOOT. That is right.

Mr. FLETCHER. As I understand, the Senator from Utah wants to reduce the rate from 10 to 5 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to reduce it, and then a vote can be taken upon the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will confine his amendment to the numeral "10" in line 3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the pending amendment. [Putting the question.] The ayes have it, and the amendment to the amendment is agreed to. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 154, line 7, strike out "10" and insert "5," so that it will read:

Intaglio method, 5 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. WHEELER. I did not understand that that was the next amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. The whole amendment, when it is perfected, will be voted upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair stated the amendment on line 3, reducing "10" to "5," which was agreed to. The clerk will state the next amendment, which is "25," in line 4. The Senator from Utah said he intended to propose an amendment to it.

Mr. SMOOT. I move to strike out "25" and insert "12½."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to reject that amendment entirely. That is on cotton cloth woven with printed or stamped warp yarn or threads, 25 per cent ad valorem, to which the Senator now proposes an amendment reducing the rate.

Mr. SMOOT. In other words, the Senator wants that stricken out?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I move to strike that out entirely, as well as the remainder of that section, "on cotton cloth printed by the surface or relief method."

Mr. SMOOT. Then, Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment; and will have a vote upon the amendment suggested by the Senator, striking out all after the words "ad valorem," on line 3, down to and including the words "ad valorem," on line 7.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia propose that amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I offer that amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, last night I interrogated my colleague [Mr. WHEELER], inquiring of him whether he had information as to the percentage of the wholesale price of cotton goods that goes to the payment of labor; and he advised us at that time that he had not the exact figures.

I have asked that the figures be procured for me; and I have here a table giving the percentage of the wholesale price of cotton goods that goes to labor, as well as to a large number of other commodities.

The table shows that in the case of cotton goods 24.3 per cent of the wholesale price is allocated to labor. I introduce this table for the purpose of showing how perfectly absurd is the contention that these duties are levied in the interest of labor, and to cover the difference in the labor cost in this country and abroad.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I remark, if the Senator will pardon me just a moment, that this is not a matter of speculation at all. It is a matter of absolute computation, as I shall show directly.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was wondering if the Senator would explain how that compares with the proportion allocated to labor in other industries.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I find that in the case of silk goods the proportion allocated to labor is 18.7 per cent of the wholesale price. In the case of wool manufactures it is 21 per cent. In the case of hosiery and knit goods it is 23 per cent. In the case of glassware it is 28.3 per cent. In the case of men's shirts it is 17.8 per cent, and so on.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, has the Senator the figures for boots and shoes?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not find boots and shoes in the schedule that I have.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The proportion is much higher there, I believe.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But let me remark that the proportion runs from 38 per cent in the case of earthenware and china-ware, and 37 per cent in the case of clocks and watches, down to 3.9 per cent in the case of linseed oil; but in practically every case the total percentage going to labor is less than the tariff rate.

Let me remark, Mr. President, that these figures are arrived at in a very simple way. The census returns give us the total amount for which a particular line of produce is sold in the market, and from the returns of the companies we are likewise given the amount that they actually pay in wages; and it is a simple matter of dividing the amount paid for labor by the total sale price, and that gives us the percentage which goes to labor.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, who prepared the figures?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. These figures were prepared under the direction of Mr. Miles, of the Fair Tariff League, by Mr. Ludwig, an experienced statistician of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope these figures are more correct than those that he may have provided upon the cost to the consumer of the duties imposed in the different paragraphs of the bill.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The cost to the consumer is a mere matter of speculation, gathered from many inquiries of the retailers of these commodities. The increase to the manufacturer, assuming that the duties are effective—and they would not be asked if they were not to be effective—is a matter of absolute computation; but in the matter of the cost to the consumer as compared with the advantage to the manufacturer, of course, there is an opportunity for a wide margin.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know of a better time than now to call attention to the report which has gone into the Record professing to show that the rates in the present tariff bill will cost the American people certain amounts. I desire to call attention to how the amounts have been figured out, and how Mr. Miles and his associates arrive at those figures. I have taken the pains to go through all of them, and I want the Senate now to understand how they were arrived at.

SUPPOSED "PROFITS" TO PRODUCERS AND "COSTS TO CONSUMERS" BECAUSE OF THE DUTIES UPON INDUSTRIAL AND AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

The senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has recently presented figures, prepared by the Fair Tariff League, purporting to show the cost to the American people of the protective duties on manufactured products from Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and New York. The figures in round numbers run into the billions. The cost for Pennsylvania products is supposed to be \$1,400,000,000; for New York, \$1,800,000,000; and for the six States named, over \$5,400,000,000. On iron and steel alone, for the single State of Pennsylvania the tariff act of 1922 is supposed to have "profited" the steel manufacturers \$237,000,000, and the proposed Senate bill is supposed to yield a profit to them of \$268,000,000. The cost to the consumer, for some unknown reason, multiplies these huge figures by two, and has the tariff act of 1922 costing the consumers of Pennsylvania iron and steel \$474,000,000, and the Senate bill costing \$536,000,000.

Such absurd figures carry their own condemnation. The reason for the absurdity of the figures is found in an examination of the method of their compilation. The fallacious assumption underlying the whole tabulation is that the duties written in the tariff act increase the wholesale prices, not only for the imported product but also of all the domestic products, by the full amount of the duty, and, worse still, that the cost to the consumer is two times the full duty. If the duty on pig iron is \$1 per ton, it is assumed that every ton of iron imported, and every ton of the millions produced in the United States for the manufacture of steel, will be increased in price at wholesale by the full amount of the duty, and at retail by two times the duty.

Such an assumption is exactly contrary to the principles of a protective tariff. On the average and in the long run protective tariffs do not, nor are they meant to, increase the price of the domestic article by the amount of the duty. On the other hand the usual result is an ultimate reduction in the price of the products protected. A protective tariff is imposed for the purpose of reserving an important portion of the domestic market to the domestic producers, in order that they may expand their production, and thereby sell at continually lower prices as the economies of large-scale production are realized. That prices are lower under protection as a result of expansion of the domestic industry will be indicated later on in the discussion.

If anyone desires to believe that the figures quoted respecting the billions of dollars that the protective tariff has cost the American people because of the protection offered to the industries of the principal industrial States, he may be interested in what, from the same fallacious point of view, the protective tariff has cost the American consumers of farm products. The States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas have about the same population as the State of Pennsylvania, and they are in the heart of the agricultural region in the same sense that Pennsylvania is in the heart of the industrial region. To those who are fond of fallacious arithmetic a little calculation respecting the agricultural products in these States will be of interest.

Applying the rates of duty in the tariff act of 1922 and in the Senate bill to 30 of the important agricultural products of the States named, it is found that these States have "profited"—in the same sense that Pennsylvania has "profited" by the tariff—under the rates of duty in the tariff act of 1922 to the extent of \$701,423,000, based on the census of production for 1925, and that under the proposed Senate bill the supposed "profit" will be \$1,073,327,000. Using the same arithmetic respecting the cost to the consumer as was used by the Fair Tariff League, the "cost to the consumer" for the protection of

the agricultural products in the States named has been \$1,402,846,000, and under the proposed law the supposed cost will be approximately \$2,146,654,000. Obviously no one believes any such talk when applied either to industry or agriculture. It is no less absurd, however, to assume that the duties on agricultural products increase the price of the domestic production by the full amount of the duty than it is to assume that the prices of iron and steel are increased by the full amount of the duties. No one familiar with tariff problems would make such a calculation for either industry.

Going somewhat more into detail in the hypothetical and fallacious calculations respecting agriculture in the States named, it is found that by this method of arithmetic a 2-cent per pound duty on cattle will "profit" the farmers in the five States approximately \$149,000,000 and will cost the ultimate consumer of beef approximately \$299,000,000.

By the same method of reasoning the wheat crop in the five States named will show a profit to the farmers under the proposed Senate bill of about \$108,000,000, and will cost the consumer of flour two times that, or about \$216,000,000. The corn crop will yield a supposed profit of more than \$155,000,000, and an additional cost to the consumer of over \$310,000,000. Even the hay crop is supposed to show a profit of about \$120,000,000, and an additional cost to the feeders of \$238,000,000.

It is obvious from the absurd figures as to the supposed profits to producers and costs to consumers of industrial products produced in the East, and agricultural products produced in the Middle West, that they are all mere idle arithmetic and give no indication whatever of the effects of the present or proposed duties upon the prices of the products considered.

Reference was made a few moments ago to the expansion of domestic industries, with a consequent reduction in prices, under a protective tariff system. That this price reduction actually occurs is indicated by the following facts:

The price index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics for all commodities declined from 150.5—upon the 1926 basis of 100—in December, 1919, to 97.6 in June, 1928. Apparently the protective tariff of 1922 did not succeed in raising prices as compared with 1919 under the Underwood Act, as the Fair Tariff League would have us believe. Going more into the particulars of the decline in price under the protective system it is found that the price index for all metals and metal products declined from 137 in December, 1919, to 98.7 in June, 1928. The iron and steel price index declined from approximately 134 in 1919 to 92.2 in the middle of 1928. Pennsylvania does not seem to have taken advantage of the increased tariff on metal products, as she is supposed to have done.

The same story is told for all other important industrial products. The index for all textiles declined from 164.5 in December, 1919, to 96.3 in June, 1928. Wool textiles dropped from 135.8 in 1919 to 101.2 in 1928; silk textiles from 191 to 82.6, and cotton textiles from 187 to 101. Chemicals and drugs showed a price decline from 164.4 in 1919 to 95 in 1928, and mixed fertilizers fell from approximately 222 in 1919 to 98 in 1928. If more specific information is needed respecting the expansion of production and decline in prices of industrial products under the protective tariff, it may be had in the form of statistics for particular products. Steel plates, for example, an important product in Pennsylvania, showed a production of 992,000 tons in 1919 and 1,244,000 tons in 1927.

Meanwhile the prices of these plates had fallen from approximately \$61 per ton in Pittsburgh in 1919, to \$40.77 per ton in 1927, an increase of 25 per cent in production, and a decline of almost exactly one-third in price. The production of galvanized sheets increased from 1,500,000,000 pounds in 1919 to 2,767,000,000 pounds in 1927. Prices declined from \$108 per ton in Pittsburgh in 1923 to less than \$81 in 1928.

Turning to the chemical schedule it is found that the production of citric acid has increased from 3,163,000 pounds in 1919 to more than 7,000,000 pounds in 1927, and that the price per pound has declined from about 95 cents in 1919 to 45 cents in 1928. The production of methanol increased from the low figure of 2,800,000 gallons in 1921, to 7,400,000 gallons in 1926. The production declined somewhat in 1927 because of heavy imports of the synthetic product. Meanwhile the price had declined from \$2.10 per gallon in January, 1921, to the low figure of 40 cents per gallon in 1928.

One of the most outstanding developments in the chemical industry under the protective-tariff system is the development of coal-tar dyes and related products. The quantity of coal-tar dyes produced in the United States in 1919 was approximately 63,400,000 pounds. In 1927 it was more than 95,000,000 pounds. A more important story is indicated by the decline in prices. From a weighted average sales price of \$1.26 per pound in

1917 and \$1.08 in 1920 there has been a continuous decline until the average price in 1927 was 39 cents per pound. Evidently the great dye producers of Pennsylvania and New Jersey have not realized how much "profit" they could have made out of the protective tariff if they had been able to use the arithmetic of the Fair Tariff League.

These illustrations of reductions in prices under protection could be multiplied indefinitely, but a sufficient number of them have been given to illustrate the fundamental principle underlying the protective theory, namely, that protective rates are not for the purpose of increasing prices, but to reserve a large portion of the domestic market to the domestic producers, in order that by expanding production, prices to the consumer under competition may be reduced.

Another serious fallacy underlying the tabulation of the Fair Tariff League in regard to the cost to the agricultural States of protective-tariff rates on industrial products is the fact that it neglects the importance of the markets in prosperous industrial centers for agricultural products. Much is heard about the importance of foreign markets for domestic agricultural products. As a matter of fact, these markets are almost negligible as compared with the great consuming industrial centers of the United States. If these industrial centers are prosperous, and if the workers have money to buy with, the agricultural States have the highest market in the world for their products. If the industrial centers are in the throes of depression their markets for agricultural products are bad. A 10 per cent decline in domestic purchases in industrial centers is worse than a 50 per cent decline in foreign purchases. The whole question reduces itself to the simple statement that if the industrial areas have money to spend, they will spend it; and if they do not, the farmer must seek markets elsewhere, or let his produce rot in the fields.

Another important effect of prosperous manufacturing industries is the fact that they withdraw surplus agricultural labor from the farms to the factories, and thereby reduce the burdensome agricultural surplus for some commodities. The farm surplus is one of the most important questions confronting the country to-day, and this surplus would unquestionably be much larger if the industrial centers were not drawing off the labor

supply which would otherwise be adding to the agricultural surplus.

In view of the obvious close relation between industrial and agricultural prosperity, with each group of industries furnishing a market for the other's products, it is difficult to understand the current opposition to industrial protection. The belief seems to be current that the relatively small foreign markets for agricultural products in which the consumers have 50 or 75 cents per day to spend upon all commodities, and probably half that amount upon food, can be of more importance from the point of view of agricultural relief than the larger spending powers of domestic industrial centers, with our wage scales running up to \$10 per day. To cripple domestic industries would seem to be the shortest route to agricultural disaster, because of the destruction of the farmers' best and highest-priced markets.

It is hard to understand how anyone can believe that the industrial East is costing western consumers billions of dollars, as calculated by the Fair Tariff League, when as a matter of fact such areas are the best markets in the world for agricultural products, and at the same time the prices of industrial products are continually declining because of the expansion of the industries under the protective system, and lower unit costs due to mass production and to increased efficiency of labor.

For the use of those who are interested in absurd arithmetic consent is requested to insert as a part of my remarks a table showing the production of the important agricultural products in the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas, to which have been applied the rates of duty in the Tariff Act of 1922 and in the Senate bill, together with the fallacious calculations as to how much such rates will "profit" the American farmer, and how much they will "cost" the ultimate consumers, upon the same erroneous premises as those used in the tables prepared by the Fair Tariff League and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 7 and November 11, 1929.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Supposed "protection to producers" and "cost to consumers" because of the duties in the tariff act of 1922 and the pending Senate bill on important agricultural commodities produced in the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas, calculated upon the same fallacious basis as that used by the Fair Tariff League in computing similar data for industrial products produced in Pennsylvania and published in the Congressional Record November 7, 1929

[Production data obtained from the Census of Agriculture, 1925]

Product	Unit of quantity	Production in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas	Rate of duty		Protection to producers		Cost to consumers	
			Act of 1922	Senate bill	Act of 1922	Senate bill	Act of 1922	Senate bill
Livestock:								
Horses.....	Number	441,200	\$30 each.....	\$30 each.....	\$13,236,000	\$13,236,000	\$26,472,000	\$26,472,000
Mules.....	do.	49,600	do.....	do.....	1,488,000	1,488,000	2,976,000	2,976,000
Cattle.....	do.	6,474,000	1½-2 cents per pound.	2-2½ cents per pound.	148,902,000	186,128,000	297,804,000	372,256,000
Sheep.....	do.	978,000	\$2 each.....	\$3 each.....	1,957,000	2,935,000	3,914,000	5,870,000
Goats.....	do.	7,500	do.....	do.....	15,000	22,000	30,000	44,000
Swine.....	do.	29,874,000	½ cent per pound.	2 cents per pound.	35,849,000	143,395,000	71,698,000	286,790,000
Chickens.....	do.	94,815,000	3 cents per pound.	8 cents per pound.	11,378,000	30,341,000	22,756,000	60,682,000
Livestock products:								
Dairy products:								
Butter made on farms.....	Pound.....	79,655,000	8 cents per pound.	14 cents per pound.	6,372,000	11,152,000	12,744,000	22,304,000
Butterfat sold (in cream).....	do.....	525,066,000	20 cents per pound.	56.5 cents per pound.	12,652,000	35,806,000	25,304,000	71,612,000
Cream sold.....	Gallon.....	13,055,000	20 cents per gallon.	56.6 cents per gallon.	2,611,000	7,389,000	5,222,000	14,778,000
Whole milk sold.....	do.....	482,272,000	2½ cents per gallon.	6½ cents per gallon.	12,057,000	31,348,000	24,114,000	62,696,000
Wool produced (1928 on basis of clean content).	Pound.....	8,486,000	31 cents per pound.	31 cents per pound.	2,631,000	2,631,000	5,262,000	5,262,000
Eggs produced.....	Dozen.....	418,760,000	8 cents per dozen.	10 cents per dozen.	33,501,000	41,876,000	67,002,000	83,752,000
Farm crops:								
Grain—								
Corn.....	Bushel.....	621,685,000	15 cents per bushel.	25 cents per bushel.	93,253,000	155,421,000	186,506,000	310,842,000
Wheat.....	do.....	256,483,000	30 cents per bushel.	42 cents per bushel.	76,945,000	107,723,000	153,890,000	215,446,000
Oats (threshed).....	do.....	590,858,000	15 cents per bushel.	16 cents per bushel.	88,629,000	94,537,000	177,258,000	189,074,000
Barley.....	do.....	53,218,000	20 cents per bushel.	20 cents per bushel.	10,644,000	10,644,000	21,288,000	21,288,000
Rye.....	do.....	19,354,000	15 cents per bushel.	15 cents per bushel.	2,903,000	2,903,000	5,806,000	5,806,000
Flaxseed.....	do.....	7,973,000	40 cents per bushel.	36 cents per bushel.	3,189,000	4,465,000	6,378,000	8,930,000
Sorghum.....	Pound.....	18,791,000	2 cents per pound.	2 cents per pound.	18,791,000	18,791,000	37,582,000	37,582,000
Hay, tame and wild.....	Short ton.....	23,827,000	\$4 (long ton).....	\$5 (short ton).....	85,096,000	119,135,000	170,192,000	238,270,000
Miscellaneous—								
Sugar beets.....	do.....	1,219,000	80 cents (long ton)	80 cents (short ton)	871,000	975,000	1,742,000	1,950,000
Tobacco.....	Pound.....	33,196,000	35 cents per pound.	35 cents per pound.	11,619,000	11,619,000	23,238,000	23,238,000
Potatoes (white).....	Bushel.....	82,938,000	50 cents per 100 pounds.	75 cents per 100 pounds.	24,881,000	37,322,000	49,762,000	74,644,000
Potatoes (sweet and yams).....	Value.....	682,000	25 per cent.	50 per cent.	136,000	228,000	272,000	456,000
Orchard fruits, apples (harvested).....	Bushel.....	7,267,000	25 cents per bushel.	25 cents per bushel.	1,817,000	1,817,000	3,634,000	3,634,000
Total.....					701,423,000	1,073,327,000	1,402,846,000	2,146,654,000

¹ The number of cattle have been converted to pounds for purposes of calculating duty by using 1,150 pounds per head.

² The number of swine have been converted to pounds for purpose of calculating duty by using 240 pounds each.

³ The number of chickens have been converted for purpose of calculating duty by using 4 pounds each.

⁴ The pounds of butterfat sold in cream have been converted to gallons for purpose of calculating duty at 8.3 pounds to gallon.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah has resorted to a style of argument which is not altogether novel. Having presented certain figures to demonstrate that labor as a rule does not get any more than 20 to 25 per cent of the sale price of commodities upon which the tariff is levied, and being entirely unable to refute these figures or avert the deductions to be drawn therefrom, he proceeds to demonstrate that some figures in relation to the actual ultimate results to the consumers given in some other tables at some other time are not accurate.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not even seen the tables to which the Senator has referred. When they are put in the RECORD I shall look at them. These are more likely to be true than the others were, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But the figures are the figures of the Census Bureau. The figures the Senator is talking about were not the figures of the census returns at all, as I tried to explain. These are figures drawn from the official census returns.

The Senator resorts to another line of argument not altogether novel in connection with a discussion of tariff problems. He lists a large number of commodities upon which tariffs are levied, the prices of which through a long period of years

have declined. We have a tariff upon these products, and the prices have declined; therefore the tariff occasioned the decline in the prices. The Senator omitted to call attention to the fact that a multitude of things produced in this country upon which there is no tariff at all at the same time have declined in price. I endeavored to direct his attention to a conspicuous example in the case of automobiles, which have declined in price continuously.

The same thing might be said with respect to sewing machines. The same thing might be said with respect to radio sets and a number of other things. One could prove anything by that method of reasoning. We have epidemics in this country every once in a while and we have the high tariff, and the conclusion would be from that sort of reasoning that the high tariff occasioned the epidemics. We have business panics, horrible business depressions in the country every once in a while, and at the same time we have the high tariff, and the argument would be that the high tariff caused the business depressions. That form of reasoning does not trouble anybody.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the schedule to which I have referred may be incorporated in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The schedule is as follows:

The tariff—Distribution of benefits

(1) Product	(2) Domestic production, census 1927	(3) Domestic wages, census 1927	(4) Per cent. wages to production	(5) Act of 1922, tariff rate, average ad valorem imports, 1927	(6) Act of 1922, tariff protection to manufactures, 1927	(7) Revenue to Government imports, 1927
	Dollars	Dollars	Per cent	Per cent	Million dollars	Dollars
Cotton goods.....	1,655,984,792	402,845,762	24.3	46.6	263	22,333,247
Cotton laces, embroideries, etc. ¹	23,764,215	6,602,887	27.8	{(75 to 90)}	11	10,398,863
Silk goods.....	750,291,792	140,100,291	18.7	58.0	275	18,693,545
Wool manufactures.....	859,873,143	180,475,052	21.0	55.8	308	22,113,554
Hosiery and knit goods.....	816,620,494	188,163,458	23.0	64.4	320	9,250,533
Shirts, men's.....	241,649,939	42,997,827	17.8	39.4	68	8,536
Corsets, brassieres, etc.....	77,218,202	12,402,288	16.1	49.5	26	7,107
Clothing.....	2,574,789,719	426,337,581	16.6	52.3	884	13,284,446
Carpets and rugs.....	164,709,290	41,484,975	25.2	52.8	57	11,441,384
Gloves, leather.....	36,662,053	8,813,912	24.0	50.2	12	5,346,683
Furs.....	426,271,956	70,667,283	16.6	26.7	90	3,846,934
Umbrellas, parasols, canes, etc.....	23,156,400	3,411,261	14.7	40.0	7	171,217
Trunks, valises, suitcases, etc.....	59,958,681	13,084,687	21.8	33.0	15	1,214,803
Rubber goods.....	1,224,941,390	198,052,473	16.0	28.3	270	532,092
Earthen, stone, and china ware.....	437,246,629	168,643,893	38.6	58.2	161	13,016,942
Glassware.....	366,217,797	103,466,441	28.3	52.5	126	9,823,543
Toys and games.....	91,963,619	23,227,274	25.3	70.0	38	3,226,988
Chocolate and cocoa.....	122,723,229	7,339,405	6.0	17.9	19	270,744
Confectionery.....	391,927,343	56,980,548	14.5	40.0	112	354,367
Starch.....	33,679,369	2,612,407	7.8	43.7	10	505,028
Paints and varnishes.....	519,009,842	40,184,732	7.7	33.8	131	1,269,420
Linseed oil.....	73,367,776	2,849,310	3.9	48.5	24	209,889
Oilcloth and linoleum.....	99,185,468	13,617,027	13.7	34.9	26	405,383
Medicinal preparations.....	388,552,068	28,606,894	7.4	24.1	75	1,369,105
Perfumery, cosmetics, etc.....	161,245,659	10,965,085	6.8	46.9	51	3,255,478
Explosives.....	72,489,698	8,131,234	11.2	36.8	20	354,129
Musical instruments.....	225,881,856	60,570,367	26.8	40.7	65	1,978,992
Hardware.....	208,253,586	60,827,474	29.2	60.4	78	45,193
Cutlery and edge tools.....	76,688,444	20,270,326	26.4	104.2	36	1,562,846
Aluminum manufactures.....	123,557,112	20,891,843	16.9	38.7	34	373,586
Brass, bronze, and copper manufactures.....	519,892,352	92,894,420	17.9	38.5	145	959,064
Clocks and watches.....	85,391,842	31,574,587	37.0	49.3	29	7,444,183
Stamped and enamel ware.....	290,672,154	75,367,044	25.9	41.7	86	14,462
Tinware.....	253,478,691	35,000,822	13.8	40.0	72	3,532

¹ Included with cotton goods.

Remember, in reading the above table, that tariff rates (column 5) should not equal American wages (column 4) but only the difference, often nil, between our wage costs per unit of product and foreign wage costs.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber when the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] commenced his remarks. I came in during the delivery of his eloquent oration. He showed a feeling that I have never seen exhibited before by the Senator from Utah, and when, in his graceful way, he turned his fiery eyes upon me I felt like getting out of the Chamber. I was afraid he was angry. I hope he did not feel that way.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; I certainly did not.

Mr. NORRIS. He made a wonderful argument. He has answered to his own satisfaction some of the tables and figures which have been put into the RECORD by different Senators, myself among the number, prepared by Mr. Miles. It may be that later on when I come to examine his figures I shall want to reply further, but for the present I want to say that he assumes to begin with, in the argument where he makes the comparison with the farmer, that the farmers' rates or the rates in the tariff schedule on the main farm products are just as

effective as the rates in the tariff schedules on manufactured products, an assumption which everybody who knows anything about the tariff knows is absolutely erroneous.

It is common knowledge, it was admitted in the Republican platform, it was admitted in the campaign by the Republican candidate for President, that the farmer was not getting the benefit of the protective tariff, and yet the Senator can take the law and show where the rates on some of the principal farm products were away up nearly to the sky, 42 cents on a bushel of wheat, and so forth. But everybody knows that it did not do the farmer any good. Everybody said so. The Senator from Utah himself said so. It was a matter of common knowledge. And yet the Senator in his argument assumes that the same thing applies to the manufactures schedules. Likewise everybody knows that the tariff is not fully effective in every instance, though in many instances it is effective 100 per cent. When we take these facts into consideration it seems to me that all of

the arguments the Senator from Utah has made against these rates, based on the theory that the manufacturer adds the tariff to his product, fall to the ground.

The Senator then goes on to show what would be probable if the rates on farm products which are not effective were effective. If 42 cents a bushel was effective on wheat, if all of the rates on the other agricultural products, such as corn, oats, and so forth, upon which there is a tariff, but on which the farmer gets practically no benefit whatever, were effective, then the same conclusion would follow that the Senator had in his table—he had it in his speech, anyway—that these great things would be added particularly to the cost of the consumers in the Western States, and they would have to pay on account of the tariffs that had been levied on the farmers' products, which, as a matter of fact, in many instances were put there for the express and only purpose of deceiving the farmer who produced that product. That was common knowledge for many years, and it was a common practice to point to the fact that in recent years we have had a high tariff on farm products.

What we have been trying to do in this country ever since the war, and in good faith, is to give to the American farmer the benefit of the protective-tariff system, not to tear down the system, but to extend its benefits to all of our people, and give to the American farmer the same tariff benefits that the manufacturers get. There was no attempt to tear down what the manufacturers are getting. I have said before, and I repeat now, that if we continue to prevent legislation that will give to the farmer the benefit of a protective-tariff system under which he must live, if we continue to take those benefits away from him, and still compel him to bear his hardships, the time will come when he will help to tear down the citadel of protection, even though some of its destruction comes upon his own head, because it is impossible for any educated men, any civilized people, to live without limit as to time under a system that is so unfair and so unjust.

When these tariff plans were submitted, commencing soon after the war when this great discrepancy began to be felt, there were a few of us who were denounced in all kinds of ways. In some instances we were absolutely ostracized. Everything we proposed was cast aside as being uneconomical and something that would not work. When we failed with one and brought in something else, the same thing happened again. Assuming that those who held the power in their hands in the White House and in the Senate were perfectly honest in the position which they took, that they were perfectly conscientious, then it was up to them to do one of two things, either to say, "Here is something the farmer suffers from that can not be remedied and he will have to continue to suffer," or themselves to bring in something that would give him relief.

That was a fair proposition. Those of us who have been working along those lines since the World War have tried on many occasions to bring relief. We have submitted remedies; they have not done so. The Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] has not. If what we have been trying to do is not good, if with the enormous power of the President of the United States, with the patronage extending all over the United States and the machinery of the political party in power, those in control have been able to prevent us putting on the statute book what we believe would bring relief, why do they not put something there? Why has not the Senator from Utah brought in a bill, why did not President Coolidge suggest one, why has not President Hoover suggested one that will take care of the agricultural surplus. The Republican Party pledged itself in its platform to give relief to agriculture, to put it on an equal basis with industry, but it has not been done; and, Mr. President, you know it has not been done. In many instances those who have tried to do it have been condemned and ostracized. If they are mistaken, if they are wrong, then, in the name of honesty and the pledges made to the American farmer, do something yourselves. Do not sit idly by and continue to raise, as the committee proposes to do, the tariff higher and higher. When we have been called together to give the farmer relief under the tariff, the answer is to raise the tariff wall still higher and to condemn those who dare to complain of what it is sought to do.

Let us have a show-down. We have tried, but we have failed. Let us see what you can do. We tried to relieve the farmer, and you, through your power and influence, have prevented it. Now, you give him relief. You will find no opposition from those who have been fighting for him, lo, these many years. They will gladly welcome anything that will give relief to stricken agriculture. Common honesty demands that you try to do that with some plan of your own or stop condemning those who have been trying to do it. Either bring in a remedy that you think will bring relief or admit that you do not know how to do it; that you do not know anything about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to the committee amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I made a statement last night to the effect that the United States could compete with any other country in the manufacture of cotton goods, regardless of the tariff. That statement was challenged, I think, by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. He said that he thought I had made a very broad statement. I put into the Record to-day some figures showing that we were producing cotton goods in this country cheaper than they were being produced in Great Britain. I now wish to call attention of the Senate to an article which appeared in the Political Science Quarterly, edited for the Academy of Political Science by the faculty of political science of Columbia University, for June, 1929, with reference to the cost of production in Japan, and pointing out that the United States can compete in foreign countries with Japan and can undersell Japan. Of course, I will say at the outset that I know the Senator from Utah will not agree with any statistics which I furnish or that are furnished by the author of the article in this magazine. I quote from the article, as follows:

The output per American worker in pounds of cloth per 10-hour day is from four to ten times the Japanese worker's output. Seven and a half times the Japanese output is the average. Seven and a half times the output and five and one-third times the wage leaves the American manufacturer with a wage cost per pound of cloth that is less than the Japanese. In spite of the incredibly cheap Japanese labor, American manufacturers produce at a wage cost per pound of cloth that is from 18 to 57 per cent less than the Japanese.

Then, after citing the tables, the article continues:

It is almost unbelievable until the differences in individual output on similar grades of cloth are examined. The Japanese worker is producing 8 and 10 pounds of cloth to the American 88 and 97; 11 and 12 to 185; 19 to 168; 35 to 148. Even a wage of 60 cents a day can not make up that difference. The fault is not the worker's. The machinery, the methods of production, and the cheap wage system are the chief causes.

Since the wage costs on American yarns average 39 per cent more per pound of yarn than the Japanese, and the wage costs on American cloth (not including the labor costs in the yarn) average 33 per cent less per pound of cloth, the one nearly balances the other. This explains why American textile manufacturers can sell in the same international markets with the Japanese. The superior efficiency of the American worker offsets to a very considerable extent any advantage the Japanese manufacturer may have in lower wages. And when the extra labor costs that grow out of the cheap labor system are added to the wage, the Japanese manufacturer is found to benefit very little, if any, by his so-called cheap labor.

It is the general presumption that Japanese manufacturers have a great advantage over western industrialists in their supply of cheap labor with long working hours. That Japan's labor is her major industrial asset is quite true, but its cheapness is altogether another matter. The resources of labor are abundant, but labor for industrial purposes is scarce and unskilled, and above all it is not cheap, because it is inefficient. The extra payments that subsidize the cheap wage, the multiple cost of inefficient labor, the effect of poor and uneven quality from unskilled hands, are as real costs as the cheap wage. The wide margin of difference in individual output between American and Japanese labor suggests a fertile field of research for Japanese industrialists.

Mr. President, as I said a while ago, when we get the facts with reference to the cost per unit in Japan and when we get the facts as to Great Britain, we find that in both those countries the cost per unit per man is higher than it is in the United States. Yet we here see Senators on the other side of the Chamber constantly getting up and saying, "Why, we must protect American labor from the Japanese, from the English, and from the Germans." The facts stated in the article plainly demonstrate that, as a matter of fact, the cotton manufacturers of this country do not need any tariff at all, though since 1922 they have been having the highest tariff in the history of the United States. Notwithstanding that fact, we are proposing to raise the tariff rates in this Congress which was called into special session for the benefit of agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.] By the sound the noes seem to have it.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am sure I did not understand the purport of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment, and I do not think other Senators understood it.

Mr. GEORGE. I think there was a misapprehension.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Georgia proposes to amend the committee amendment on page 154, line 3, by striking out after the words "ad valorem" down to the period in line 7, as follows: "on cotton cloth woven with printed or stamped warp yarn or threads, 25 per cent ad valorem; on cotton cloth printed by the surface or relief method, as distinguished from the engraved or intaglio method, 10 per cent ad valorem."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment. [Putting the question.] By the sound the noes seem to have it.

Mr. GEORGE. I call for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I hope the entire committee amendment will be disagreed to, because the domestic product which is known as "cotton cloth woven with printed or stamped warp yarn or threads" is selling below the foreign product in the domestic market. The same is true of cretonne covered by a subsequent portion of the amendment. I thought that it might be proper to allow the organdie rate to be reduced by one-half and go to conference, on the theory that the manufacture of organdie was probably a new business in the United States, and inasmuch as operators had to operate under a Swiss patent that there was some real justification for allowing the amendment to go to conference with a small rate of duty, but, Mr. President, the domestic tapestries and upholstery products and cretonne described in other portions of the paragraph are to-day selling well below the cost of the foreign products in this market, and there is not a particle of excuse for the additional duties which are sought to be imposed. I ask for the yeas and nays on the committee amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Let us have the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Fletcher	Kendrick	Shortridge
Barkley	Frazier	Keyes	Simmons
Bingham	George	La Follette	Smoot
Black	Gillett	McCulloch	Steck
Blaine	Glass	McKellar	Steiwer
Blease	Glenn	McMaster	Stephens
Borah	Goff	McNary	Swanson
Bratton	Goldsborough	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Brock	Greene	Norbeck	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Hale	Norris	Townsend
Broussard	Harris	Nye	Trammell
Capper	Harrison	Oddie	Tydings
Connally	Hastings	Overman	Vandenbergh
Copeland	Hatfield	Patterson	Wagner
Couzens	Hayden	Pittman	Walcott
Cutting	Hebert	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Heflin	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Deneen	Howell	Sackett	Waterman
Dill	Jones	Schall	Wheeler
Fess	Kean	Sheppard	

Mr. SCHALL. My colleague [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is ill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. WHEELER. I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the form of the question on which we are voting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A negative vote will give assent to the proposal made by the Senator a while ago.

Mr. GEORGE. And the amendment is to agree to the committee amendment, subparagraph (e)?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment, subparagraph (e), as amended.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President, we could not hear what was said at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. The committee amendment, beginning on page 153, at line 22, reads:

In further addition to the foregoing duty or duties provided in this paragraph for cotton cloth there shall be paid the following duties, namely: On cotton cloth finished with a permanent crispness, resiliency, and translucency, such as and including cloth commercially known as permanent finished organdie—

The committee amendment read "10 per cent." That is now changed to—

5 per cent ad valorem; on cotton cloth woven with printed or stamped warp yarn or threads, 25 per cent ad valorem; on cotton cloth printed

by the surface or relief method, as distinguished from the engraved or intaglio method, 10 per cent ad valorem.

(f) In no case shall the foregoing duty or duties imposed upon cotton cloth in this paragraph be less than 5 cents per pound.

(g) Tire fabric or fabric for use in pneumatic tires, including cord fabric, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. GEORGE. I understood the question to be on the adoption of subparagraph (e) only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, as amended.

Mr. GEORGE. The clerk read the other subparagraphs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on subparagraph (e), as amended.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that it is quite apparent that the Senate does not intend to vote for this amendment so long as it includes the provisions from line 3 to line 7. If the Senator could withdraw that part of the committee amendment—

Mr. SMOOT. That has been rejected. The provision on line 3, beginning with the words "on cotton cloth," down to line 7, has already been rejected.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The committee amendment has been rejected?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and the 10 per cent on line 5 has been reduced to 5 per cent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been rejected, but that remains in the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Then I understand that the only provision that is pending for approval upon the part of the Senate is the amendment commencing at (e) on page 153, and going to the words "ad valorem" on line 3 of page 154.

Mr. SMOOT. I am told that the amendment of the Senator from Georgia on lines 3 to 7 was rejected.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, of course, the pending question will be upon agreeing to the committee amendment, with an amendment striking out "10" and inserting "5."

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Do I understand that the provisions of the original committee amendment from lines 3 to 7, inclusive, have been rejected?

Mr. GEORGE. No; they were expressly approved by the Senate, and, therefore, I moved to reject the entire committee amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? If the amendment beginning with the word "on" on line 3, down to and including the words "ad valorem" on line 7, were rejected by another vote, would the rest of it be satisfactory to the Senator?

Mr. GEORGE. If that were stricken out, I stated to the Senator—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the motion of the Senator from Georgia was to strike out that language, and his motion was defeated; so that language is still in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NORRIS. The yeas and nays have been ordered; and I wish the clerk would call the roll.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent for a reconsideration of the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NORRIS. I object to that. We had a full debate on it and voted on it, and it was defeated.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. What was the motion of the Senator from Georgia as applied to the part of the amendment beginning on line 3, continuing on down to and including line 7? What was the motion of the Senator from Georgia, and what was the decision?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To strike out those words.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Was the motion carried?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was rejected.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask whether subdivisions (f) and (g) are involved in the question now before the Senate?

Mr. SMOOT. No; they will come later.

Mr. FLETCHER. They are not now involved?

Mr. SMOOT. They are not pending at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the committee, as amended.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, what I was trying to suggest to the Senator from Utah was that he agree to the rejection of that part of the committee amendment which embraces the language between line 3 and line 7 on page 154.

If he does not do that, his whole amendment will be defeated, together with the change made by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMOOT. I have just asked unanimous consent that that be reconsidered and that the Senate reject the amendment. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] objects to that.

Mr. FLETCHER. Unanimous consent is not required for a reconsideration.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, we had quite an extended debate upon the motion of the Senator from Georgia to strike out something. The Senator from Utah was opposed to striking it out, and after debate we had a vote; and the motion of the Senator from Georgia, although I was one of those who voted for it, was defeated. Now, the Senator from Utah, having successfully led an assault upon that amendment and having defeated it, realizes that by defeating it he probably has left something in the committee amendment that will add to the likelihood of defeating the committee amendment; and he desires to reconsider it and compromise by agreeing to what he would not agree to a while ago in order to save the committee amendment.

That is the reason why I have objected. We are about to vote. We have had a roll call ordered upon the committee amendment; and I do not see why we should continue to talk about something that we voted on a while ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been demanded by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. Is there a second?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, a point of order. The yeas and nays have already been ordered.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; they have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk informs the Chair that they have not been ordered. Is there a second?

Mr. NORRIS. They have been ordered once, but we can order them again.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment as amended. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], and vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I transfer the pair which I have with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and vote "nay."

Mr. SACKETT (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. TOWNSEND (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. Not knowing how that Senator would vote, I refrain from voting.

Mr. TYDINGS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce the following general pairs: The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]; and

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. BLEASE. I have a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. BRATTON. I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], and vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—26

Bingham	Goff	Kendrick	Smoot
Broussard	Goldsborough	Keyes	Thomas, Idaho
Dale	Greene	McCulloch	Townsend
Deneen	Hale	Moses	Walcott
Fess	Hastings	Oddie	Waterman
Gillett	Hebert	Patterson	
Glenn	Kean	Shortridge	

NAYS—51

Allen	Connally	Harris	McMaster
Barkley	Copeland	Harrison	McNary
Black	Couzens	Hatfield	Norbeck
Blaine	Cutting	Hayden	Norris
Borah	Dill	Heflin	Nye
Bratton	Fletcher	Howell	Overman
Brock	Frazier	Jones	Pittman
Brookhart	George	La Follette	Ransdell
Capper	Glass	McKellar	Robinson, Ind.

Schall
Sheppard
Simmons
Steck

Steinwer
Stephens
Swanson
Thomas, Okla.

Trammell
Tydings
Vandenberg
Wagner

Walsh, Mass.
Walsh, Mont.
Wheeler

NOT VOTING—18

Ashurst
Blease
Caraway
Edge
Gould

Hawes
Johnson
King
Metcalf
Phipps

Pine
Reed
Robinson, Ark.
Sackett
Shipstead

Smith
Warren
Watson

So the amendment of the committee as amended was rejected. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 154, after line 7, to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

(f) In no case shall the foregoing duty or duties imposed upon cotton cloth in this paragraph be less than 5 cents per pound.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I would like to inquire what the effect of this amendment would be.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think any imports of this article come in.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, if there are no imports, why should we insist that the tariff be either increased or kept at any specific point?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know that it would serve any good purpose. If there is any useful purpose that it could serve, I would have no opposition to it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I make a statement as to why this amendment was inserted in the bill?

Mr. GEORGE. I would like to have the Senator's explanation.

Mr. SMOOT. This provision is put into the bill to take care of cloth made of yarns under No. 9, very coarse yarns. It is true that last year the imports amounted to only \$344 worth, but there may be and have in the past been certain goods coming into style made out of very coarse yarn. The thread itself is as large as the woolen thread used in a blanket. It is a very large thread, used in goods that may be stylish one year and a great quantity of which may be used, and another year there may be very little used. This is simply to take care of that situation, and nothing else.

Mr. NORRIS. Having heard the explanation of the Senator from Utah, I am convinced that there is no use in this provision, and that the amendment ought to be rejected.

Mr. SMOOT. Let us have a vote.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Utah if the figures are correct that last year only \$344 worth of these goods came in?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and I stated the reason why. Perhaps next year there will not be any importations, or any made in the United States.

Mr. HARRISON. Will there not be less next year if the duty is increased and if the House rate is retained?

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. NORRIS. If we want to make the importations smaller, let us raise the tariff. We can fix them. If these fellows are going to insist on bringing something in, we will raise the wall a little higher. Instead of making the duty 10 per cent, let us make it 90 per cent. If 5 per cent is not enough, we can soon make it high enough so that it will be impossible to bring any in.

Mr. HARRISON. It seems to me this would be absolutely ineffective.

Mr. SMOOT. As I said to the Senator before, there may not be any of these goods imported next year, and the following year there may be great quantities imported. It is a minor matter, and I care not what the Senate does with it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, if I understand the Senator, subdivision (a) in this paragraph levies a protective duty upon all cloth of yarn number above 10.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and this would take care of that cloth.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. There is no duty upon unbleached cotton cloth of a yarn count below 10. The committee inserted this amendment as an extraordinary precaution to give a little duty on cloth under the 10-yarn count. There are no imports—probably the duty will never be effective—and I do not see any good that the amendment would do.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not care anything about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have gotten together a few headlines from some of the morning papers, to which I want to call the attention of the Senate, with reference to the newly organized group on the other side, sometimes called the "Young Turks."

I do not agree with some of my colleagues with reference to the reprimands which the members of that group have recently received. I know they were organized, as everybody else in the Senate knows, to get rid of some of the obnoxious leaders on the other side, including Senator WATSON as leader, Senator JONES as assistant leader, and Senator MOSES as chairman of the senatorial committee. I am in hearty accord with their views, and I am not at all in sympathy with some of the things that have been said about them.

I would like to see them get rid of these leaders, probably for the good of the country, although from the standpoint of a Democrat I would like to see those men remain in power.

The newspapers, however, have been rather cruel to them, I think. For instance, the Washington Herald has this headline:

Ridicule routs Young Turks in Senate tariff fight. BORAH rejects rate proposal on industrials. Refusal to leave present levy fixed is blow to bloc. Allen dinner is called off.

The New York Times has a rather disparaging headline, in which it says:

Young Guard's plan on tariff spurned. Senate coalition under BORAH rejects compromise to keep the present industrial rates. Fight on textiles opens. Cotton rises approved after sugar is passed by. New bloc's tactics under fire in debate.

Then the Baltimore Sun speaks of them rather slurringly. It says:

Young Guard's tariff turned down. Coalition refuses to accept existing industrial rates. Dinner of revolt off at last moment. HARRISON chaffs Members, suggesting "Bush League" as fitting title.

The Washington Post, that conservative paper owned by Ned McLean, says:

Young Guard gets series of rebuffs. ALLEN cancels dinner and progressives reject tariff compromise. WATSON régime upheld.

Of course, we could not expect that the New York World would speak particularly friendly of them, but its headlines read:

New Senate guard meets three rebuffs. ALLEN cancels war council after breakfast with Hoover. BORAH bars compromise. McNARY rejects offer to put him in WATSON's post.

The Philadelphia Inquirer says in its headlines:

BORAH rejects compromise of Young Guards. Coalition refuses bid to boost farm duties and restore industrial levies. Senator ALLEN calls off dinner meeting after rejection. HARRISON assails "Junior League."

The New York Herald-Tribune, a Republican paper, in its headlines, says:

New Senate bloc assures WATSON of leadership. "We are for you," HASTINGS wires Republican chief; 1922 rates are rejected.

The Philadelphia Public Ledger says in its headlines:

Doom of tariff bill feared as new Senators hit snag. Coalition refuses new bloc's plea to back present industrial rates; adjournment this week likely.

Mr. President, I am sorry the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. ALLEN] saw fit to call off his dinner just because the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] poked a little fun at him. I think that really for the good of the country the Young Guard ought to go through with their plan. I am sure he will have all of Kansas back of him in rebuking the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] for calling some of his colleagues "jackasses" or rather "sons of wild jackasses." I am also sure he would have the backing of a great many of the farmers out in his section of the country if he and his Young Guard would just take the Old Guard and throw them out of their offices. One thing I am afraid of is that they are going to lose their nerve and that they are not going to stand up and do what they started out to do. We all know what they started out to do, but now it seems that because of the fact that the Senator from Mississippi got up and chided them a little bit yesterday they immediately turned around and called off the dinner and then sent a telegram down to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] in Florida saying "We are all for you." The next thing we know they will be putting their arms around the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire and saying, "We agree with you. These western progressives are, after all, the sons of wild jackasses."

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I do not know whether this is the proper place in which to express a courteous purpose or not. The dinner to which I invited some of the new Senators was largely a social matter. We have been meeting occasionally, called together by a common purpose to see if we might do anything to hurry the work of the Senate. It was probably the "mischief that Satan finds for idle hands to do." We have spent

two or three months listening to oratory until we know the oratorical attainments of every Senator, and we decided there was nothing new to learn, so we determined that if there were anything we could do to push forward the serious purpose for which the special session was called we would be glad to do it.

However, the dinner was not important. Its purpose was overemphasized. But in view of the very serious emphasis with which it has been stated by the Senator from Montana and others that I called it off because of the speech of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], I wish that I may be allowed to offer a correction. We had just received at 3 o'clock the information that the Secretary of War, who was a close personal friend of mine, was at the very point of dissolution. I did not feel like having the dinner under the circumstances. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 154, after line 10, insert the following new subparagraph:

(g) Tire fabric or fabric for use in pneumatic tires, including cord fabric, 25 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 154, line 14, before the word "shall," to strike out "silk or rayon" and insert "silk, or rayon or other synthetic textile," so as to make the paragraph read:

PAR. 905. Cloth, in chief value of cotton, containing silk, or rayon or other synthetic textile, shall be classified for duty as cotton cloth under paragraphs 903 and 904 and shall be subject to an additional duty of 5 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HARRISON. As I understand it, the amendment in lines 11 and 12, page 154, was agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was. The clerk will state the next amendment.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, before we go to that item, while it has been disposed of, yet I would like to ask some one, particularly the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], to explain the effect of the amendment in lines 11 and 12 relating to tire fabric.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Has not that amendment been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the amendment referred to on page 154, lines 11 and 12, relating to tire fabric, is inquired about by the Senator from Idaho. The rate given on fabric used in pneumatic tires is 25 per cent ad valorem and the committee merely inserted it here because it is the existing law.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I presume the Senator from Utah furnished the explanation with reference to paragraph (g) that we just agreed to?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; the Senator said it was the present law.

Mr. GEORGE. I think it is the present rate.

Mr. HARRISON. And it is a reduction from the rate adopted in the House, as I understand it, on tire fabric.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 155, line 6, after the word "vegetable," to strike out "fiber, 55 per cent ad valorem," and insert:

Fiber:

(1) Containing not more than 50 picks per inch, 50 per cent ad valorem.

(2) Containing more than 50 picks and not more than 72 picks per inch, 18 cents per square yard and 50 per cent ad valorem.

(3) Containing more than 72 picks and not more than 96 picks per inch, 36 cents per square yard and 50 per cent ad valorem.

(4) Containing more than 96 picks per inch, 54 cents per square yard and 50 per cent ad valorem.

So as to make the paragraph read:

PAR. 908. Tapestries and other Jacquard-figured upholstery cloths (not including pile fabrics or bed ticking), in the piece or otherwise, wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber:

(1) Containing not more than 50 picks per inch, 50 per cent ad valorem.

(2) Containing more than 50 picks and not more than 72 picks per inch, 18 cents per square yard and 50 per cent ad valorem.

(3) Containing more than 72 picks and not more than 96 picks per inch, 36 cents per square yard and 50 per cent ad valorem.

(4) Containing more than 96 picks per inch, 54 cents per square yard and 50 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I do not profess to know as much about this matter as the members of the committee, but I have had quite a few communications on the subject. It seems from these communications that the amendment ought not to be agreed to. One letter which I have received reads as follows:

ORLANDO, FLA., September 7, 1929.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: It has been called to our attention that under paragraph 908, relative to tapestries and other Jacquard-figured upholstery cloths, the proposed duty based on the ingenious pick count can by a difference of one pick make a difference in duty of 25 cents a yard.

We believe that this is unfair and class legislation.

We also feel the same toward paragraph No. 904, subsection (e), relative to warp printed goods.

We trust that you will do everything to defeat this proposed measure.

Respectfully yours,

DICKSON-IVES Co.,

M. B. IVES, Vice President.

Another communication is from the National Council of American Importers and Traders (Inc.). I may say that the importers do not always impress me very strongly, but facts are facts, and if these statements are true, they would seem to be rather impressive. Their letter reads as follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
AMERICAN IMPORTERS AND TRADERS (INC.),
UPHOLSTERY AND DRAPERY FABRICS GROUP,
New York, N. Y., September 5, 1929.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Believing that the Republican majority of the Senate Finance Committee fails to appreciate the tremendous increases in duty on cotton tapestries and upholstery fabrics, under paragraph 908, your attention is invited to the inclosures in the hope that when the real facts are brought out clearly you will not permit the adoption of paragraph 908 as proposed.

These increases are among the highest in the tariff bill. No such increases are proposed as to tapestries and upholsteries of silk, wool, rayon, or any other material.

The increased cost to the American housewife of tapestries or furniture covering must necessarily be tremendous. Also it is the middle classes who use these now popular-priced goods.

Our claim is that American manufacturers are amply protected under the present law. That they have already in a few years built up a substantial business is proven by the inclosed reprint of an article in the Journal of Commerce under date of September 3, 1929.

We ask your study of the matter, believing that we may then count upon your support in the interest of the consumer.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE MCGEACHIN,
Chairman Upholstery Group.

They submit sample cards of materials of various kinds, but especially they point out different illustrations of picks. On picks 50 per inch, they give the present rate as 45 per cent, the percentage of increase over the present rate of duty being 11 per cent. On picks per inch 51, the present rate is 45 per cent, and the percentage of increase over the present rate of duty is 85 per cent, as proposed by the committee amendment. On picks per inch 72, the present rate is 45 per cent and the percentage of increase over the present rate is 85 per cent. On picks per inch 73, the present rate is 45 per cent, and the percentage of increase 159. On picks per inch 96, the present rate is 45 per cent, and the percentage of increase over the present rate of duty is 159 per cent. On picks per inch 97, the present rate is 45 per cent, and the percentage of increase over the present rate of duty is 232 per cent.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. Does the communication also indicate, which I think is the fact, that the tapestries upon which the duties here are so abnormally increased, are not made in this country at all? I think the purpose is to exclude the type of tapestry so that the consumer will be compelled to use another style entirely.

Mr. FLETCHER. That may be true; but I am not clear about it. They have sent me some actual illustrations of tapestries and upholstery cloths under paragraph 908, showing the increase in duties under the pick system suggested by the Senate Finance Committee. I can not have the samples inserted in the RECORD, of course, but Exhibit A is a sample upon which the present duty is 45 per cent and the actual rate proposed in the bill is 81 per cent; Exhibit B, present duty 45 per cent and actual rate fixed in the pending bill 69 per cent; Exhibit C, present duty 45 per cent and actual rate fixed in the bill 84 per cent; Exhibit D, present rate 45 per cent, actual rate fixed in the bill 102 per cent; Exhibit E, present duty 45 per cent, actual rate fixed in the bill 80 per cent; Exhibit F, present duty 45 per cent, actual rate fixed in the bill 100 per cent.

I ask to have their statement relating to the subject inserted in the RECORD, together with an article reprinted from the Journal of Commerce of September 4, 1929, sent to me by them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SENATE BILL RATES ON TAPESTRIES AND OTHER JACQUARD-FIGURED UPHOLSTERY CLOTHS UNDER PARAGRAPH 908, A CLOTH WITH A FOREIGN COST OF 75 CENTS PER YARD 50 INCHES WIDE, SHOWING THE TREMENDOUS INCREASE GRANTED ON INEXPENSIVE GOODS, HOW UNEQUALLY IT WORKS OUT ON VARIOUS PICK COUNTS, THAT A DIFFERENCE OF ONE PICK CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE IN DUTY OF 25 CENTS PER YARD

Tapestries and other Jacquard-figured upholstery cloths are made 50 inches to 54 inches wide; the Senate bill grants the following specific rates, in addition to 50 per cent ad valorem:

Containing not more than 50 picks per inch, 50 per cent ad valorem.

Over 50 to 72 picks, add 18 cents per square yard, which is equal to 25 cents per linear yard, 50 inches.

Over 72 to 96 picks, add 36 cents per square yard, which is equal to 50 cents per linear yard.

Over 96 picks, add 54 cents per square yard, which is equal to 75 cents per linear yard.

Example has been figured on a foreign fabric costing 75 cents per yard.

Picks per inch	Rate and amount of duty	Actual percentage of duty on foreign cost	Present rate	Percentage of increase over present rate of duty
50	Rate, 50 per cent; duty, 37 cents per yard	50	Per cent 45	11
51	Rate, 50 per cent plus 25 cents per yard 50 inches wide; duty, 62½ cents per yard, only 1 pick more	83½	45	85
72	Duty, 62½ cents per yard	83½	45	85
73	Rate, 50 per cent plus 50 cents per yard 50 inches wide; duty, 87½ cents per yard, only 1 pick more	116	45	159
96	Duty, 87½ cents per yard	116	45	159
97	Rate, 50 per cent plus 75 cents per yard 50 inches wide; duty, \$1.12½ per yard, only 1 pick more	150	45	232

Actual illustrations of tapestries and other Jacquard-figured upholstery cloths under paragraph 908 showing gigantic increase in duties under the ingenious pick system suggested by Senate Finance Committee
[Rate and amount of duty per yard]

	Present rate, 45 per cent	50 per cent for 50 picks per inch and under	Over 50 to 72 picks, add 18 cents square yard (=25 cents a linear yard 50 inches wide), plus 50 per cent ad valorem	Over 72 to 96 picks, add 36 cents square yard (=50 cents a linear yard 50 inches wide), plus 50 per cent ad valorem	Over 96 picks, add 54 cents square yard (=75 cents linear yard 50 inches wide), plus 50 per cent ad valorem
Foreign value, 75 cents per yard.	Duty, 33¾ cents	Duty, 37½ cents, being 11 per cent increase over present rate.	Duty, 62½ cents, being 85 per cent increase over present rate.	Duty, 87½ cents, being 159 per cent increase over present rate.	Duty, \$1.12½, being 232 per cent increase over present rate.
Foreign value, \$1 per yard.	Duty, 45 cents	Duty, 50 cents, being 11 per cent increase over present rate.	Duty, 75 cents, being 66½ per cent increase over present rate.	Duty, \$1, being 122 per cent increase over present rate.	Duty, \$1.25, being 177 per cent increase over present rate.

Actual illustrations of tapestries and other Jacquard-figured upholstery cloths under paragraph 908 showing gigantic increase in duties under the ingenious pick system suggested by Senate Finance Committee—Continued

	Present rate, 45 per cent	50 per cent for 50 picks per inch and under	Over 50 to 72 picks, add 18 cents square yard (=25 cents a linear yard 50 inches wide), plus 50 per cent ad valorem	Over 72 to 96 picks, add 36 cents square yard (=50 cents a linear yard 50 inches wide), plus 50 per cent ad valorem	Over 96 picks, add 54 cents square yard (=75 cents a linear yard 50 inches wide), plus 50 per cent ad valorem
Foreign value, \$1.25 per yard.	Duty, 56¼ cents.....	Duty, 62½ cents, being 11 per cent increase over present rate.	Duty, 87½ cents, being 55½ per cent increase over present rate.	Duty, \$1.12½, being 100 per cent increase over present rate.	Duty, \$1.37½, being 144 per cent increase over present rate.
Foreign value, \$1.50 per yard.	Duty, 67½ cents.....	Duty, 75 cents, being 11 per cent increase over present rate.	Duty, \$1, being 48 per cent increase over present rate.	Duty, \$1.25, being 85 per cent increase over present rate.	Duty, \$1.50, being 122 per cent increase over present rate.
Foreign value, \$1.75 per yard.	Duty, 78¾ cents.....	Duty, 87½ cents, being 11 per cent increase over present rate.	Duty, \$1.12½, being 42½ per cent increase over present rate.	Duty, \$1.37½, being 74½ per cent increase over present rate.	Duty, \$1.62½, being 106 per cent increase over present rate.
Foreign value, \$2 per yard.	Duty, 90 cents.....	Duty, \$1, being 11 per cent increase over present rate.	Duty, \$1.25, being 38½ per cent increase over present rate.	Duty, \$1.50, being 66½ per cent increase over present rate.	Duty, \$1.75, being 94½ per cent increase over present rate.

Foreign value	Present rate	House rate	Senate compound rates actually work out as follows (duty figured by percentage)			
	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent
75 cents per yard.....	45	55	50	83½	116	150
\$1 per yard.....	45	55	50	75	100	125
\$1.25 per yard.....	45	55	50	70	90	110
\$1.50 per yard.....	45	55	50	66½	83½	100
\$1.75 per yard.....	45	55	50	64	78	93
\$2 per yard.....	45	55	50	62½	75	87½

As nearly all tapestries and Jacquard-figured upholstery fabrics are made 50 to 54 inches wide, the figures above are based on this width.

[From the Journal of Commerce, New York, Wednesday, September 4, 1929]

PHILADELPHIA UPHOLSTERY MILLS RUNNING FULL TIME, SURVEY SHOWS—SMALLER PLANTS OPERATING ON DOUBLE SHIFTS COVERING FORWARD ORDERS—DRAPERY LOOMS ALSO ENGAGED ON OUTPUT—WHOLESALE AND LARGE DEPARTMENT STORES ENTER PRIMARY MARKET FOR FALL NEEDS

PHILADELPHIA, September 2.—Drapery and upholstery manufacturers as a whole are actively engaged on production, with many of the smaller plants running on double or overtime shifts, a survey of this center reveals.

Those mills which depend largely upon furniture makers as an outlet for their goods are finding volume steadily increasing. From reports of the early summer furniture show in Chicago further improvement can be expected as sales at the exposition are said to have been the heaviest in a number of years. This activity will not be reflected in primary circles fully until November or December, but it will carry along into the spring months, according to millmen.

WHOLESALE ORDERS INCREASE

Orders are now coming through more freely from jobbers and department-store buyers, but the disadvantage of this business is that it has been delayed. On some drapery lines delivery demands by the representatives of larger stores can not be met. This applies particularly to accounts which amplify drapery and upholstery advertising in September and October and increase their usual inventories for that period.

In plush goods a heavy volume is being sold on low-end cotton velours, but profit margins have been small. A striking division in color demand is noted on these fabrics, light pastel shades being eagerly taken by the Pacific coast, while the Middle West and East hold to standard colors, principally reds.

ANTICIPATE SEPTEMBER MEETING

In connection with the coming meeting of mohair plush manufacturers in New York, September 10, to act on standardizing the constructions of that fabric, mill officials here said that cotton velours would be benefited by a similar study. Competition on these lines has been especially severe and the price on a number of cloths has been pushed below \$1. Producers frankly admit that in meeting these ranges quality has been sacrificed. It is also feared that there may be a consumer reaction on account of the questionable wear on the extreme low-priced materials.

Such standardization of velours would be more difficult to effect than of mohair plushes, in the opinion of producers. Constructions are more numerous and there is greater variety in methods of weaving and dyeing. The establishment of a minimum fiber content and the fixing of wearing tests would nevertheless serve as a check to the present downward trend in making these fabrics, it is believed.

DISCUSS RAYON JACQUARD WEAVES

The growing interest in the National Textile Upholstery Association and its program for trade improvements has given rise to discussion with regard to rayon Jacquard weaves. Mills making the fabric believe

it has assumed an importance which will warrant cooperative action in the future.

Technicians have overcome the major faults of the first rayon Jacquards, but at the present rate of expansion and the increasing pressure on price manufacturers contend that the fabric's popularity must be guarded. It is pointed out that with an association it will be possible for the mills to develop and protect vogues in certain cloths and in this way reach a sale volume not possible in the previously disorganized competition.

Demand for rayon Jacquards embraces a wide variety of patterns, ranging from large all-over florals to small diamond and geometric figures.

Mr. COPELAND obtained the floor.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may present a communication for insertion in the RECORD in connection with the discussion of the textile schedule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. HEBERT. I hold in my hand a letter addressed to me by the officials of the American Federation of Textile Operatives of Fall River, Mass., indorsing the proposed increased rates in the textile schedule. I ask that the letter may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEXTILE OPERATIVES,

Fall River, Mass., August 22, 1929.

HON. FELIX HEBERT,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please allow us to bring to your attention copy of resolution adopted by above-named organization at our recent convention dealing with matters relative to tariff on textile goods.

"Resolution

"Whereas there is now pending before Congress a report of a committee to increase tariff on imported textile goods; and

"Whereas we believe that it is necessary and for the best interest of the industry that such legislation be enacted: Be it

"Resolved, That we, the delegates to the convention of the American Federation of Textile Operatives in convention assembled, unanimously indorse the proposed increase in the tariff on these goods and urgently petition Congress for early and favorable consideration of the proposed increase; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our Senators and Representatives in Congress."

While our national organization is interested in the whole subject matter relative to increased tariff in textiles, our prior interest is centered in and precedence is given to Schedule 9 of the proposed tariff bill, dealing with cotton manufactures, particularly with paragraph 904, dealing with cotton cloths. We therefore respectfully and earnestly

request your favorable consideration and support when this important matter comes before your honorable body.

We remain, yours respectfully,

JAMES TANSEY, *President*.
WILLIAM HARWOOD, *Secretary*.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island if the communication from the textile workers of Fall River does not refer chiefly to paragraph 904 (a), upon which the Senate has taken favorable action?

Mr. HEBERT. It does, Mr. President.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senate has not yet acted upon paragraph 908.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I refer to paragraph 904.

Mr. COPELAND. Very well. It is paragraph 908 to which I wish to address myself.

Mr. President, we are dealing here with the home decorations of the poorer and middle classes. I want to ask the Senator from Utah if it is not a fact, as stated by the eloquent Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], that there has been a very material increase in the rates of duty proposed by the amendment reported by the committee over the rates of existing law?

Mr. SMOOT. I will tell the Senator in a very few minutes what the increases are.

Mr. COPELAND. I think it will be interesting to know exactly.

Mr. SMOOT. There are increases, and I want to tell the Senator just what they are.

Mr. COPELAND. Very well.

Mr. SMOOT. In the first place the rate under existing law is 45 per cent ad valorem covering all tapestry, no matter how many picks to the inch there may be. The House increased that rate to 55 per cent ad valorem. When the bill came to the Senate the Senate Finance Committee struck out 55 per cent ad valorem and made four subdivisions of the paragraph. In those subdivisions the ad valorem rate is 50 per cent, but a specific duty outside of the ad valorem rate is added in the second, third, and fourth subsections of paragraph 908, and those specific rates represent increases.

In the case of subparagraph (2), which reads:

Containing more than 50 picks and not more than 72 picks per inch, 18 cents per square yard and 50 per cent ad valorem—

the duty of 18 cents per square yard, taken with the duty of 50 per cent ad valorem provided by the Senate Committee, is more than the 55 per cent rate provided in the House bill. The same statement applies to subparagraph (3) and subparagraph (4). That is a picture of the action taken in its relation to the rates of the House bill and those of existing law.

Mr. COPELAND. Now let us translate the rates proposed into specific terms. The rate under existing law is 45 per cent. The lowest rate under the proposed duty, translated into a specific rate, would be what?

Mr. SMOOT. The rate in subparagraph (1) is a reduction from the rate provided by the House. That is the only reduction in the paragraph.

Mr. COPELAND. The actual rates under the bill as recommended by the Finance Committee would be, as I understand, 81 per cent, 69 per cent, 84 per cent, 102 per cent, 80 per cent, and 100 per cent.

Mr. WAGNER. Those are the equivalent ad valorem rates?

Mr. COPELAND. They are the equivalent ad valorem rates.

Mr. SMOOT. I suppose the Senator has some particular samples which show increases to that extent?

Mr. COPELAND. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. The samples, perhaps, may have been selected by the Senator, and more than likely, based on the samples he has, the figures he has stated would be correct, but, taking the paragraph as a whole, his figures are not correct. I say that the House bill increased the duty on all classes of material of this kind, the cheap as well as the higher priced, 5 per cent ad valorem. The Senate committee reduced the ad valorem rate on the goods containing not more than 50 picks per inch from 55 per cent, the House rate, to 50 per cent ad valorem, and then, in subsections (2), (3), and (4), added a specific rate which when taken with the ad valorem rate is an increase over the House rate.

Mr. COPELAND. Then the fact is, Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to say a word further.

Mr. COPELAND. Very well.

Mr. SMOOT. The only justification for the increases that I can see is that the importations are very large. In 1923 the importations were \$1,158,696, while in 1927 they had increased to \$5,483,040.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question there?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. The class of tapestry which has been imported is different, is it not, from the tapestry which is manufactured in this country, principally in the State of Pennsylvania, and the domestic tapestry sells at a lower price in the market than does the imported tapestry?

Mr. SMOOT. That is only one style, but all styles are imported.

Mr. WAGNER. The information I have is that as to all of the styles which are affected the imported article sells at a higher price than the domestic article.

Mr. SMOOT. That is so in certain cases. It is true of the higher-priced article, but as to the lower-priced tapestry that is not the case.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I will be glad if the Senator will allow me to complete my statement. Then I will be happy to answer any questions the Senator may desire to ask me.

Mr. COPELAND. Very well.

Mr. SMOOT. As I was saying, the importations in 1927 had increased to \$5,483,040 from \$1,158,696 in 1923.

Mr. COPELAND. From what is the Senator quoting?

Mr. SMOOT. I am giving the importations.

Mr. COPELAND. From what?

Mr. SMOOT. From the report of the Tariff Commission. The importations declined slightly in 1928 to \$5,008,147. In 1927 the imports, including duty, totaled \$7,950,387, or about one-half of the domestic production of tapestries for the same year, which are officially valued at \$16,612,012. Based upon American valuation, the figures as to the imports show that the imports are almost half of the total production in the United States.

That was the only basis on which the increase was granted by the House, I think; in fact, I know it was; and, as I have already stated, in subsections (2), (3), and (4) the Finance Committee has recommended increases. I do not care whether the amendments shall remain in the bill or not.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator for what he has said, but I want to call his attention to a telegram I have just received; and, in order that the record may be accurate, I wish it to be noted that the telegram comes from the upholstery group, national council, by George McGeachin. I will read the telegram in a moment, but I first desire to quote a sentence from it, which reads:

Tariff Commission and Census Bureau concede figures domestic production not complete. Accurately gathered would show domestic production keeping full pace with imports.

I take it from this telegram that an investigation is going on and that even the figures in so accurate hands as those of the Senator from Utah can not be complete.

Mr. SMOOT. I took the figure showing the amount of duty paid upon the value of the article according to the invoice; so that there can be no mistake as to them. As to whether the domestic production is keeping pace with the importations, I can not say offhand, because I have not the figures before me on that point.

Mr. COPELAND. I want to be perfectly fair in this discussion and to give the telegram exactly as it comes to me. Now I am going to read the telegram, and I will be glad if the Senator from Utah will give his attention to it.

Paragraph 909, Fordney-McCumber law, adequately protects merchandise covered by proposed law, paragraphs 908 and 909, unreasonable rates under vicious pick system, paragraph 908 raises duties on cotton upholstery fabrics over 100 per cent solely in the interest—

I presume he means paragraph 909.

Mr. SMOOT. What he means is paragraph 908. The pick provision is found in subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4), to which I have referred.

Mr. COPELAND. Of course that is what he is referring to. The telegram continues:

Solely in interest few manufacturers in Philadelphia district manufacturing under antiquated methods. Tariff Commission and Census Bureau concede figures domestic production not complete. Accurately gathered would show domestic production keeping full pace with imports. This is the home decoration of the poorer and middle classes. Paragraph 904 by ingenious system of building up compound duties—

That we have already gone over.

The letters I have received relating to this paragraph are numerous. Senators will see here scores of letters. Anyhow,

from these letters I have selected two. Each of them is from a woman.

Here is a letter from Isabel Chilton Scott, of 427 Park Avenue, New York. She says:

Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND,

New York, N. Y.

DEAR SENATOR COPELAND: I am writing to join my voice in protest against this pernicious tariff bill. As you see from my letterhead I am a decorator, and the placing of additional tax on textiles and furniture does concern me, not so much for my own personal interests as for the interests of the women whose homes I decorate. When our American manufacturers can so improve their fabrics in quality and color and design they can by these honest and legitimate factors shut out European competition. The competition is in the higher-class fabrics which they can not produce. To give them the protection of the tariff is to put a premium on inferior output. It is as if I said to the public, "I know there are better decorators, who can give you better goods, but I need the money and you must all come and patronize me or I will get some law passed to make you pay more for what you are now getting."

Americans are such globe-trotters that it is getting to be that our home and country is where our hat is, which makes for an international mind, that in a few years will consider these high tariffs between countries as absurd as we would now consider them between New York and Virginia.

The average American home is emerging from its Victorian ugliness and later drabness to some sense of beauty and art, and let us help it along by giving it the best curtains and chairs and sofas we can, even if they do come from England or France.

Yours for the protection of the American home,

ISABEL CHILTON SCOTT.

Here is a letter from Julia Galusha Whitcomb, of 115 East Forty-eighth Street. She says:

SEPTEMBER 17, 1929.

Senator COPELAND, of New York,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The proposed duty rates of House bill 2667, which have been greatly increased by the Senate Finance Committee, are unfair, unjust, and unreasonable.

Those who know the full import of this bill realize that under cover of farm protection it places an embargo on imported fabrics, leaving us, who use them, without substitutes. For nothing manufactured in this country approaches, in quality or artistic merit, these importations. Our quantity-production methods prohibit the manufacture of what only artistic peoples with inherited craftsmanship and standards can produce.

Making enemies of the very people with whom we wish to extend our export trade, is our Government unaware that it is starting an economic war; does it not discern the tide of resentment rising on all sides?

Averaging about six months yearly in Canada and Europe, I see a determined, widespread growth, fostered by every press, inexorably against importations from the United States. As a decorator engaged largely in Canadian work, I do not dare, now, suggest an American product until every other means is exhausted; and then I do so with extreme care and tact. I can assure you from intimate knowledge that this spirit is growing in Canada by leaps and bounds. And everywhere, at home and abroad, I find increasing distrust of our Senate, with honest minds questioning whether the majority of its Members are not either uninformed of the world about them, asleep with heads under tightly folded wings, or sold to the highest bidder.

I beg you will not consider this in anyway a personal reproach. I am merely telling you of what I find about me everywhere. Assuring you of appreciation of your every effort to discourage this point of view and to encourage us who watch your endeavors to disapprove it.

Very truly yours,

JULIA G. WHITCOMB.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. I understood the attitude of the Senator from Utah to be that it was a matter of entire indifference to him whether this amendment is agreed to or not.

Mr. SMOOT. All I ask is a vote on it.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator feels that way about it, I am perfectly willing to have a vote. To me it is an outrageous thing to think that we would propose to increase, practically to double, the rate upon a form of decoration which is used in the modest home. If it were a luxury, such as I discussed this morning with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE], if it related to \$6 neckties or some luxury of great price, I should be glad to vote for it, but not for this, because it goes into the simple homes of our country.

Mr. SMOOT. Not only the simple homes but the luxurious homes, too.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, attention has been drawn to the fact that tapestries and other Jacquard-figured upholstery cloths, not including pile fabrics or bed ticking, are dutiable under the existing law at 45 per cent ad valorem. The House changed that rate to 55 per cent ad valorem; and then the Senate committee came along with this rather unique and unusual method of fixing duty, based upon picks per inch.

I can not forego the opportunity of speaking about that system of fixing tariff duties just for a second. I am not going to take any of the time of the Senate. A reading of this paragraph will furnish amusement, it seems to me, to anybody who will consider the facts.

It will be noted that the Senate committee established a base rate of 50 per cent ad valorem for cloth containing not more than 50 picks per inch, and then provided for three additional step-ups in the duty. For instance, cloth containing 72 picks and not more than 96 picks per inch was made dutiable at 36 cents per square yard plus 50 per cent.

Now, let me illustrate. A piece of cloth falling under this paragraph, containing 95 picks per inch, would be subject to a duty of 36 cents per square yard plus 50 per cent ad valorem. Run the shuttle back across the short space of an inch twice, and you have increased that duty to 54 cents per square yard plus 50 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am not saying anything about the amendment, but the Senator's explanation does not cover quite all the difference in the cost. Wherever you have a thread sufficient to have only 50 picks per inch, of course, that must be a very coarse thread. When you have a piece of cloth containing more than 96 picks per inch the yarn must be a very fine yarn, and must be nearly twice as fine, or just about one-half, as 50 is to 96 and above. When you are manufacturing a fine thread you have to draw the thread out twice as fine as the 50 thread. There is more waste. You have to have a finer wool. It takes twice as long.

As far as the difference in the brackets is concerned, there is not very much to be complained of; but what the Senator is complaining of is putting these specific rates upon picks per inch in this particular paragraph.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. All I am asking is a vote upon it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, a vote to reject the Senate Committee amendment would fix this duty at 55 per cent?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. I am going to ask the Senator to accept a substitute, for this reason: The statistics show that the imports are declining. That is, the imports in 1927 amounted to \$5,483,040. In 1928 they amounted to \$5,008,147.

Mr. SMOOT. That is quite a percentage of the amount produced in this country.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; but for the first six months of 1929 they amounted to only \$2,102,088, which is a considerable decline in fabric of this kind. The only reason I am suggesting it, I want to say to the Senator, is that when the bill goes to conference, if we have adopted the rate in the existing law, there will be an effort, of course, to accept the House rate if the facts upon careful examination justify it; but if we take the House rate we will increase the duty on these cloths 10 per cent when it does not seem to me that it is justified. In other words, the conferees would be bound if we accept the House rate, which is an increase from 45 per cent to 55 per cent, and yet the imports are going down.

I think the Senate ought to take the existing rate. The matter will go to conference; and if, upon a closer examination of the facts, the House rate of 55 per cent seems justified, it will be a mere matter of the conferees agreeing upon it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that tapestries are imported into the United States in greater quantity during the last six months of every year than they are during the first six months.

Mr. GEORGE. That may be true; but I was comparing the imports for the first six months of this year and for the first six months of 1928.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is correct in the statement he made as to the first six months of 1928. He will find, however, that from July 1 to December 1 there will be more imports, and always have been more imports, than from January 1 to June 30. That comes about because of the fact that people are cleaning house in the fall and they buy more then, and Christmas time is coming on, and so forth.

Mr. GEORGE. I was making the suggestion because it would appear in the debates that this matter was sent to conference for the purpose of enabling the conferees to ascertain definitely the facts about these imports and the domestic production.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator is perfectly correct on the first proposition, and I do not know but that the same thing applies to the other.

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the rate of 45 per cent in the present law be substituted for the Senate committee amendment; but I wish to repeat what I said, that I want the matter to go to conference primarily.

Mr. SMOOT. Let us vote on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Georgia moves to strike out "55" and insert "45."

Mr. GEORGE. I move to strike out the whole Senate committee amendment and to insert in lieu thereof—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Senate committee amendment is a motion to strike out and insert.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; to strike out "55" and insert "45."

Mr. SMOOT. The question would be, in lieu of the Senate committee amendment, to strike out "55" and insert "45."

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Now the question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment of the committee as amended was rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read a telegram with reference to this and other items of the cotton schedule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the telegram will be read.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the telegram.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator that a similar telegram has already been put in the Record.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not know that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withdraw the telegram?

Mr. COPELAND. It is the same telegram which I read a moment ago.

Mr. BARKLEY. I beg the Senator's pardon; I was out of the Chamber when he read the telegram. I withdraw it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, it is perhaps generally known that the Federal Power Commission has for the last two or three weeks been engaged in hearings on applications for permits to develop the power site on the Flathead River in the State of Montana, which has received the consideration of the Congress on a number of occasions. As is well known, that is one of the great water powers of the country, ranking with Muscle Shoals.

The taking of testimony was completed on last Saturday. I have on my desk a copy of the report of the testimony, with a list of the voluminous exhibits introduced. I am going to ask unanimous consent that the testimony be published as a public document.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I ask whether the investigation was conducted as the result of a resolution of the Senate?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No; it was not.

Mr. SMOOT. I am fearful that the request of the Senator can not be complied with, unless the investigation was pursuant to a resolution of the Senate. If the Senate authorized the investigation, then there would not be any question about it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senate did not authorize it.

Mr. SMOOT. The commission itself began the investigation of its own accord?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The commission itself conducted the investigation. The applications for permits are filed and the commission takes the testimony.

Mr. SMOOT. Then the commission ought to print the testimony itself and not the Senate. That is why we appropriate money for the commission. I am not objecting in this case particularly, but if such requests were complied with all of the printing for such commissions would be done by the Senate rather than by the commissions themselves. We stopped doing that in the past; it has not been done for several years. If the investigation had been in conformity with a resolution of the Senate there would not be any question about it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me remark to the Senator that when hearings are conducted by order of the Senate, or investigations of that kind are held, the testimony is printed and is made available to the public without any specific resolution upon the subject at all.

Mr. SMOOT. Did the Senate instruct the commission to make this investigation?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No; not at all.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I do not see how we can do it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am quite in error if it has not been repeatedly done in the past.

Mr. SMOOT. It has not been done in any case I know of for a long time.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I am unable to get reports of the Tariff Commission printed by the Senate, and the Tariff Commission themselves could not print them because they did not have any money for that purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. If the commission has lacked money for the purpose, and has asked for an appropriation for the printing of testimony, and so on, we have never refused them. If the commission will ask for an appropriation in the first deficiency appropriation bill, if it has not the money for printing, I am perfectly willing that it shall be made available to the commission immediately.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I will act on the suggestion of the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I want the Senator from Montana to understand that I do not object to the printing of this particular record, I would like to see it printed, but if we do it in this case we shall have every department of the Government making similar requests of us.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I realize the force of what the Senator says, and I withdraw the application.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 156, line 6, after the words "ad valorem," to insert "but not less than 16½ cents per pound," so as to read:

PAR. 911. (a) Quilts or bedspreads, 25 per cent ad valorem; if Jacquard-figured, 40 per cent ad valorem; blankets, 35 per cent ad valorem but not less than 16½ cents per pound; if Jacquard-figured, 45 per cent ad valorem; Jacquard-figured napped cloth, 45 per cent ad valorem; towels, other than pile fabrics, 25 per cent ad valorem; if Jacquard-figured, 40 per cent ad valorem. The foregoing rates shall apply to any of the foregoing wholly or in chief value of cotton, whether in the piece or otherwise.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I hardly think the chairman of the committee will insist upon this amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Let us have a vote.

Mr. GEORGE. That is satisfactory to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I will say to the Senator from Montana that the ad valorem rate is fixed here at 35 per cent. The average unit value of imports in 1928 was 54.6 per cent on each blanket, and when there are 2 pounds of cotton in each blanket, it will amount to 27.3 cents per pound. Sixteen and one-half cents, the minimum fixed, would be equivalent to fixing a rate of 60.44 per cent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 157, line 4, after the word "and" to strike out "lamp, stove, and candle" and insert "lamp and stove," so as to read:

PAR. 912. Fabrics, with fast edges, not exceeding 12 inches in width, and articles made therefrom; tubings, garters, suspenders, braces, cords, tassels, and cords and tassels; all the foregoing, wholly or in chief value of cotton or of cotton and india rubber, and not specially provided for, 35 per cent ad valorem; spindle banding, and lamp and stove wicking, wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I notice that "candle wicking" is stricken out. Is it inserted later?

Mr. SMOOT. It is moved to another part of the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. At a higher rate?

Mr. GEORGE. I think I may explain that it is a rearrangement, and there is no increase. It goes back to the 1922 rate. It is a decrease from the House rate.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, it is a great decrease from the House rate. Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The purpose of taking out candle wicking was to give that commodity a lower rate in another place?

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 157, line 6, after the words "ad valorem," to insert "candle wicking, wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber, 10 cents per pound and 12½ per cent ad valorem."

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe the Senator from Georgia stated that the rate in the amendment just acted upon was a reduction from the rate provided in the present law. Would that refer to this amendment also?

Mr. GEORGE. It would be a reduction below the rate in the bill as it passed the House, and the restoration of the rate in the present law on candle wicking. I may say to the Senator that the imports of candle wicking are very small. It is a negligible item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 157, line 14, before the words "ad valorem," to strike out "50 per cent" and insert "70 per cent," so as to read:

Labels, for garments or other articles, wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber, 70 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. GEORGE. I would like to have some explanation of that increase.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I can state just exactly why the majority of the committee increased this rate.

The articles covered in this amendment are sent into the United States by parcel post. The importations have never been checked up. Entering the country in that way, in many instances, they escape any duty whatever.

I do not think I have to tell the Senate of the United States the value of those labels. The committee thought that at least on the importations which were known to come in there should be this rate. It was claimed that was about the only way to handle the matter, with the hope that something could be done to prevent the labels being sent in by parcel post, as has been done in the past.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me to be a rather unusual procedure to admit that under the present rate quantities of these labels are being imported without paying any duty whatever—

Mr. SMOOT. That is the claim.

Mr. BARKLEY. And in order to correct that situation, the rate is increased from 50 per cent to 70 per cent, which will hold out still further inducement for others to do likewise. It does not seem to me that those who do pay duty ought to be penalized by increasing the rates on them in order to make up for those who do not pay the duty.

Mr. SMOOT. I was thinking of another item which will come up later. When the labels do come in by parcel post, the duty is paid; but they are not included in the estimate of the amount of importations. I will call the attention of the Senate to the other matter after a while.

Mr. BARKLEY. Even the corrected statement of the Senator does not offer sufficient explanation to me to cause me to vote for this increase.

Mr. SMOOT. I suppose there was not an item considered by the committee which presented a better case than this one.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is the case? What is the domestic production, and what are the imports?

Mr. SMOOT. We can not tell the amount of the imports, because so many of them come in by parcel post. There are about \$4,000,000 of imports, as I remember it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it seems to me that the committee went beyond all requests made of it. I very well remember the witnesses appearing before the committee and stating that they wished an increase in the duty, and what they mainly wanted was an amendment in the marking law. There was some dispute as to the amount of importations because it was claimed that this label being very small could be imported in 100 and 200 lots through the mails and that there was no real way of ascertaining the amount of the importations.

The purpose of this duty was very largely regulatory of the business. In other words, the real purpose back of the appearance of the witnesses before the Finance Committee was to obtain some regulation that would be helpful to them, rather than merely to cut out this import, although they thought that the imports were very much greater than the figures indicated.

If the Senator will recall, we provided a very drastic marking law in section 304, which reads:

Every article imported into the United States, and its immediate container, and the package in which such article is imported, shall be marked, stamped, branded, or labeled, in legible English words, in a conspicuous place, in such manner as to indicate the country of origin of such article, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. Such marking, stamping, branding, or labeling shall be as nearly indelible and permanent as the nature of the article will permit.

The Senator will bear in mind that not only must the article be marked, if it be a shirt, for instance, but the little label itself, if made in Germany, must also be marked "Made in Germany," and it must be marked in a conspicuous place, as we have required in this section, and, as I understood the witnesses who appeared before us, the manufacturers of domestically made

labels, they were more interested in a proper marking provision than in the duty, because they thought that that would afford them the protection which they really desired.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator does not think, though, as I understand it, that the way to reach that situation is by increasing this tariff rate?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I do not think so, because there would be another inducement to smuggle in, of course, as the Senator says. The inducement to smuggle is increased just as we increase the duty. I do not think the duty ought to be increased from 50 per cent to 70 per cent, particularly since we have strengthened the marking law. It seems to me that increase should be disagreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 157, after line 14, to strike out:

PAR. 913. Belts, belting, and ropes, for the transmission of power, wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of cotton or other vegetable fiber and India rubber, 40 per cent ad valorem.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

PAR. 913. (a) Belts and belting for machinery, wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of cotton or other vegetable fiber and India rubber, 30 per cent ad valorem.

(b) Rope used as belting for textile machinery, wholly or in chief value of cotton, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the next schedule, Schedule 10, paragraph 1015, might cover the matter I have in mind. I want to call the attention of the Senate, even if it takes some time, to the plea of the endless belt people to have protection in the bill and to have it made clear that they are protected.

Mr. SMOOT. That will be found on page 166 of the bill, in paragraph 1015.

Mr. GEORGE. It does not come under the paragraph now before us. This paragraph does not raise the rate, but the effect is to reduce the pending rate.

Mr. SMOOT. It reduces it from 40 per cent ad valorem to 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the present law.

Mr. COPELAND. But here is one item where I want to ask for an increase.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator had better wait until we get to the—

Mr. COPELAND. Just a moment, if the Senator please. I want to be clear about this matter before I agree to wait. Will the Senator point out where this item should go?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will turn to page 166 of the bill, paragraph 1015, he will find that it provides as follows:

Fabrics, with fast edges, not exceeding 12 inches in width, and articles made therefrom: tubings, garters, suspenders, braces, cords, tassels, and cords and tassels, all the foregoing, wholly or in chief value of vegetable fiber, except cotton, or of vegetable fiber, except cotton, and India rubber, 35 per cent ad valorem.

That is what the parties who have written to the Senator are interested in as they appeared before the committee. There may be some who are interested in rope belting and cotton belting, but most of this is used for machinery.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator will notice in paragraph 1015 that it relates to materials made of something "except cotton."

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. The article I have in mind is made of cotton.

Mr. SMOOT. Is it a belt or belting?

Mr. COPELAND. An endless belt for the making of cigarettes.

Mr. SACKETT. That comes under a different schedule.

Mr. COPELAND. Let it be pointed out to me where it comes.

Mr. SACKETT. We had it in the committee and we will have to find out now where it comes.

Mr. COPELAND. Then, to save time, let me ask that the item may go over until I find out where it is.

Mr. SMOOT. Why not agree to the pending amendment, and then if the Senator wants to have it reconsidered and opened up again he may do so.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator mean that he will not oppose my calling it up again?

Mr. SMOOT. I will not.

Mr. COPELAND. At this moment I am clear that this is the point where it should come. We are seeking to have a specific provision for endless woven cigarette machine belts composed wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber, 1 cent per belt for each millimeter of width. It does properly come here.

Mr. SMOOT. That is another matter. The Senator wants a higher rate than is provided for here. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. COPELAND. Then it does come here?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, yes. It comes in paragraph 913, and what the Senator's correspondents want is a specific rate in addition to the ad valorem rate.

Mr. COPELAND. Then I shall make my argument and the Senate must decide what it will do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York propose an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. COPELAND. I am going to propose an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Did the Senator's correspondent tell him that there are no imports of cigarette belting?

Mr. COPELAND. On the contrary, I am told that there are many imports of cigarette belting.

Mr. SMOOT. The statistics do not show it.

Mr. COPELAND. That is what my correspondent says. Let me give this information to the Senate. I am sorry to take the time, but I feel under obligation to my constituents to advise the Senate.

The signer of this petition is the Endless Belt Corporation of 345 West Fortieth Street, New York City. The letter or brief is addressed to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], and reads as follows:

We are manufacturers of a particular form of belting known as "endless woven cigarette machine belts." These belts are used in cigarette manufacturing machines for conveying tobacco to be formed into cigarettes. A sample of the belt accompanies this brief.

Imported belts of this character are now assessed with duty under paragraph 913, or paragraph 372, tariff act of 1922.

Paragraph 913, act of 1922, provides specifically for "belting for machinery, composed wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or cotton, or other vegetable fiber and india rubber, 30 per cent ad valorem."

Paragraph 372 of the same act provides for "all other machines or parts thereof, finished or unfinished, not specially provided for, 30 per cent ad valorem."

As these belts are in chief value of a vegetable fiber, namely, flax, they are now within paragraph 913, and as they are also parts of machines, they are also within paragraph 372. As the rates of duty in the competing paragraphs are the same, 30 per cent, whether they are classified under one or the other, has been immaterial.

In H. R. 2667, however, paragraph 913 has been changed to provide for "belts, belting, and ropes, for the transmission of power, wholly or in chief value of cotton and other vegetable fiber and india rubber, 40 per cent ad valorem."

The endless belts which we manufacture are conveyor belts—

I wish I might have the attention of the Senator from Kentucky, too, in this matter.

Mr. SACKETT. I did not see how that was transmission of power.

Mr. COPELAND. I continue reading from the brief:

The endless belts which we manufacture are conveyor belts, and therefore could not be classified in the proposed paragraph 913, which is limited to power-transmitting belts.

Paragraph 372, as proposed in H. R. 2667, provides for parts of machines, but limits such parts to such as are wholly or in chief value of metal. These belts could not, therefore, be classified in this new paragraph 372 as parts of machines.

Mr. SMOOT. The House provision provides for belts, belting, and ropes, "for the transmission of power." The Senate committee struck that out entirely and put in "belts and belting for machinery, wholly or in chief value of cotton." Therefore the conveyor belt to which the Senator refers falls in paragraph 913, and that paragraph does not provide for transmission of power. The House provision did.

Mr. COPELAND. I will continue my presentation and then we will have the argument.

Being in chief value of linen thread they would, therefore, probably be classified under the "catch-all" paragraph, paragraph 1023, Schedule 10, H. R. 2667, which provides for—

"All manufactures, wholly or in chief value of vegetable fiber, except cotton, not specially provided for, 40 per cent ad valorem."

Or they perhaps might be within the provision in paragraph 1015, H. R. 2667, for—

" * * * tubings * * * wholly or in chief value of vegetable fiber, except cotton, or of vegetable fiber, except cotton, and india rubber 35 per cent ad valorem."

In order to prevent uncertainty in the classification of imported endless belts of this character we believe there should be a specific provision therefor, and that for the reasons hereinafter stated the rate of duty should be increased, in view of the increases in the rates of duty on

linen thread, in H. R. 2667, paragraph 1004, Schedule 10, from which these belts are manufactured.

The manufacture of these endless cigarette machine tube belts requires highly specialized machinery and skilled workers. Prior to 1922, due to war conditions and readjustments of the industry, there were for possibly eight years or more no belts of this character imported. The Endless Belt Corporation was formed during the war for the reason that there was no source of supply, and this belt being essential for the production of cigarettes we were practically drafted by the American cigarette-manufacturing industry to develop the machinery necessary for the manufacture of these endless belts, because of our familiarity with their industry, and also with the belts.

We accordingly invested a very large sum of money in the development of such machinery and in establishing the manufacture in the United States of these belts. Since then we have been supplying the American cigarette manufacturers with a good portion of their requirements in this particular belting.

This I call to the attention of the Senator from Utah, because it shows that there are serious importations of a foreign-made belt:

However, our business is being seriously affected by offers made by German manufacturers of endless cigarette belting, who are determined to regain the dominant position they enjoyed before the war.

It is common knowledge that since 1922 there has been a very large increase in the consumption of cigarettes, and this has been reflected in an increased demand for our belts. We do not represent that the industry engaged in the manufacture of these belts is a large one, but it does give employment to an average of 50 to 75 workers, male and female. The average male wage is from \$30 to \$35 a week, and the average female wage \$20 per week.

Our average selling price for the year 1928 was \$0.5219 per belt, and our average net cost was \$0.5107. It will, therefore, be seen that this company has been selling its belts at practically cost and the reason for this has been, as stated, the continued attempts of German manufacturers to again obtain control of this market. Unfortunately we are unable to ascertain the number of belts of German manufacture imported since 1922, as this information is not available, because of the fact, as stated, that such belts may be included with the statistics covering parts of machines.

It is very clear that they had no statistics and so we must depend upon what they say about it.

We do know, however, that these German-made belts are selling at a price averaging \$2.50 to \$3 per dozen, f. o. b. Germany, which with the present duty of 30 per cent ad valorem added and the freight, which is very insignificant, will land the belt in this country much below our cost of manufacture, as illustrated by the following example.

Then they give the foreign selling price and landed cost of the German endless cigarette machine belt as follows: Selling price, f. o. b. Germany, \$3 per dozen, or 25 cents per belt; American import duty 90 cents per dozen, or 7½ cents per belt; freight and insurance, and so forth, 18 cents per dozen, or 1½ cents per belt; landed cost \$4.08 per dozen, or 34 cents per belt.

Mr. SMOOT. But there are no importations. There is one concern and one only that makes all of these belts in the United States. They have a complete monopoly. I have asked the department if there is any record of these belts coming into the country and they say no.

Mr. COPELAND. My correspondent states:

We are unable to ascertain the number of belts of German manufacture imported since 1922, as this information is not available because of the fact, as stated, that such belts may be included with the statistics covering parts of machines.

They are not classified separately. Their plea is that the German belts can be landed in New York duty paid at a price substantially below their cost and they feel that they are entitled to an increase in the rates. The example which they give and which I just read to the Senate demonstrates that the German belt can be landed in New York, duty paid, at a price substantially below their cost; that is, 34 cents for the German belt as against their cost of 51 cents, or approximately 17 cents per belt cheaper than their belt.

Mr. SACKETT. Let us have a vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York offer an amendment?

Mr. COPELAND. I move to amend by the addition of the following specific provision: In line 22 strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following:

Endless woven cigarette machine belts, composed wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber, 1 cent per belt for each millimeter of width.

Mr. SMOOT. What the Senator wants to do is to make provision for endless belts, because the paragraph itself provides

"wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber," which would apply to all within the paragraph. If the Senator wants to have the wording just as submitted to him by his correspondent, he should add another subparagraph and cover the whole thing by itself.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I ask where endless belting appears in the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. On page 157, paragraph 913. It comes under that paragraph as belting for machinery.

Mr. GEORGE. There is an endless-belt paragraph in the bill, as I understand it. The Senator is getting it out of another schedule into this one?

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator probably has in mind paragraph 1015.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from New York yield for a moment while the Chair has read a communication from the President of the United States?

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

THE LATE SECRETARY OF WAR, HON. JAMES W. GOOD

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a proclamation by the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the proclamation, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

James W. Good, Secretary of War, died in the city of Washington on the evening of Monday, November the 18th, at 37 minutes after 8 o'clock. His death, a crushing sorrow to his friends, is to the people of the country a national bereavement. Attaining to a position of high trust in private life, energetic and conscientious in his relations with his fellowmen, of a gentle, lovable, and loyal nature, inspired by a large sense of the duties of a true citizen and winning the respect and esteem of all with whom he associated, he was called, in the fullness of his powers, to discharge the duties of the peculiarly onerous and responsible office of Secretary of War, in which he served with such foresight and such loyal and lofty ideals as to confer lasting benefits to his country. His career is an example for good citizens to follow.

In respect to the memory of James W. Good, the President directs that on the day of the funeral services, Wednesday, November the 20th, the executive departments and their dependencies in the city of Washington be closed until 1 o'clock, and that the national flag be displayed at halfstaff on all public buildings throughout the United States from now until the interment shall have taken place at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, on Friday noon.

By direction of the President:

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 19, 1929.

REVISION OF THE TARIFF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I move an amendment to be inserted as subparagraph (c) in paragraph 913. I send the amendment to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 157, after line 24, it is proposed to insert a new subsection (c), as follows:

(c) Endless woven cigarette machine belts, composed wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber, 1 cent per belt for each millimeter of width.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the amendment is not in order at this time, but I ask unanimous consent that it may now be considered. I hope and trust, however, that the Senate will not adopt the amendment. There is no belting of the kind referred to imported into the United States, and there is no necessity for the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to considering the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, was my amendment just voted down?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was.

Mr. COPELAND. I am wondering if the amendment was thoroughly understood. If it was, of course, I have not a word to say, but the only concern making this material concedes that even with the proposed tariff they would still be in competition with the German product. Nobody is going to be harmed by the

importation of the foreign article except this concern, and I appeal to Senators to vote for the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. If Senators did not understand the question which was being voted on, I ask unanimous consent that we reconsider the vote by which the amendment was now rejected, and that the Senate then again vote immediately upon the amendment, so that every Senator will know what the question is. The Senator from New York can not ask any more than that. Does the Senator from New York desire a reconsideration of the vote whereby the amendment was rejected?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Was the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] rejected?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Does not that end the matter?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the reconsideration of the vote whereby the amendment of the Senator from New York was rejected? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I want to make it clear that this belting which we are talking about is made chiefly of cotton. The amendment comes properly here, and if we are going to give relief to anybody, it would seem to me that we should do so in this case.

Mr. SMOOT. I think, if we are going to give relief to anybody, it should not be to some one manufacturing a product of which not a single solitary dollar's worth is imported into the United States.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. How much increase of duty is proposed by the amendment of the Senator from New York?

Mr. SMOOT. It is a specific duty of 1 cent on each millimeter of width of each belt, so I can not tell what the increase would be.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. What would the duty represent in ad valorem terms?

Mr. SMOOT. There is no way of knowing that; I can not tell.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Are there no imports of any kind?

Mr. SMOOT. There are none at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is upon agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 158, line 3, before the words "ad valorem," to strike out "45 per cent" and insert "55 per cent," so as to make the paragraph read:

PAR. 914. Knit fabric, in the piece, wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber, made on a warp-knitting machine, 55 per cent ad valorem; made on other than a warp-knitting machine, 35 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 158, line 6, after the word "mittens," to insert "finished or unfinished," so as to read:

PAR. 915. Gloves and mittens, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I call the Senate's attention to the fact there is a great decrease proposed in this paragraph.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Is this the cotton-glove paragraph?

Mr. SMOOT. It is; and the duty is reduced from 60 per cent to 30 per cent.

Mr. GEORGE. It is a very great decrease?

Mr. SACKETT. It is a very great decrease.

Mr. COPELAND. Of course, I assume that it is inevitable that any amendment that proposes an increase of duty must be defeated, but I would not be true to my own people if I did not call attention to the plea they make. I notice in the hearings that it is pointed out that this industry is on its last legs, but certain firms in my State, the Grewen Fabric Co., of Johnstown, N. Y.; the E. B. Sudbury Co., of New York City; the Quality Silk Mills, of New York City; the Blood Knitting Co., of Amsterdam, N. Y.; the chamber of commerce of Oneonta, N. Y.; and other correspondents are asking that for the preservation

of the cotton-glove industry that the rate be continued as in the present law. I present the case to the Senate for such action as the Senate may deem wise.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 914, page 158, line 8, after the word "machine," to strike out "60 per cent" and insert "30 per cent," so as to read:

Gloves and mittens, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber: Made of fabric knit on a warp-knitting machine, 30 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in the same paragraph on page 158, line 10, after the word "machine," to strike out "50 per cent" and insert "25 per cent," so as to read:

Made of fabric knit on other than a warp-knitting machine, 25 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 158, line 17, after the words "ad valorem," to insert:

Any of the foregoing not exceeding No. 8 in size (United States measurement) valued at \$1.50 or more per dozen pairs, shall be subject to an additional duty of 2 cents per pair.

So as to read:

PAR. 916. (a) Hose and half-hose, selvaged, fashioned, seamless, or mock-seamed, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber, made wholly or in part on knitting machines, or knit by hand, 50 per cent ad valorem. Any of the foregoing not exceeding No. 8 in size (United States measurement) valued at \$1.50 or more per dozen pairs, shall be subject to an additional duty of 2 cents per pair.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator please explain that amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. I will explain the amendment, and then let the Senate vote on it. In 1922 an effort was made to put a duty upon baby hose which would have been, I will say, a little more than protective. That duty was not put in the law by the Congress, as Senators know. This amendment proposes to add 2 cents a pair upon baby hose. They are very expensive; they are made of very fine cotton, and there is, I will add, very severe competition from Germany in this line of goods. This is like the effort which was made in 1922 to increase the duty. Since that time the importations of baby hose have really increased. It is not the ordinary hose. It is the very small short hose made of the very finest kind of cotton yarn.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in view of the Senator's statement, it seems rather evident that the manufacture of this particular article can not be built up in this country. The Senator states that an exceedingly high duty was levied in 1922.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I said the manufacturers wanted an exceedingly high duty, but it was not granted.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understood the Senator to say that the duty then levied was more than protective?

Mr. SMOOT. What they asked for at that time would have been, but the duty was not granted. I only brought that matter up in order to let the Senate know something of the history of this item.

The importations of this particular kind of hose compared to the production in the United States are large. The only thing for the Senate to do is to decide now whether they want to levy this duty of 2 cents a pair on fine baby hose.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if we should reject the committee amendment, will the law then cover children's half hose as well as all other half hose?

Mr. SMOOT. If this amendment should be rejected, of course the item would fall under paragraph 916 as being hose "wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber made wholly or in part on knitting machines," and the rate of duty would be 50 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator how old would the infant have to be to have a foot 8 inches in length. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMOOT. The amendment reads:

Any of the foregoing not exceeding No. 8 in size—

That is not the size of the foot; that is the size of the stocking.

Mr. HARRISON. I imagine hose of this character would be for a pretty lusty infant.

Mr. SMOOT. The hose would have about a 4-inch foot and a 4-inch top. That is all there is to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 159, to insert:

(c) Hose and half hose, in part of rayon or other synthetic textile, shall be classified under paragraph 1309.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there are more Senators in the Chamber at this time than there were a few minutes ago, and I ask that there be read at the desk the letter from the Secretary of State announcing the death of Hon. James W. Good, Secretary of War.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Utah that the letter has already been read.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as it is half past 5, I ask, under the unanimous-consent agreement, that the Senate take a recess at this time.

RECESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 5.30 o'clock p. m. having arrived, under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senate will stand in recess until this evening at 7.30 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION

The Senate reassembled at 7 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate resumes the consideration of the unfinished business.

REVISION OF THE TARIFF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the pending amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the top of page 159 the Committee on Finance proposed to insert:

(c) Hose and half hose, in part of rayon or other synthetic textile, shall be classified under paragraph 1309.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suppose we shall have to have a quorum. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Fess	Howell	Sackett
Ashurst	Frazier	Johnson	Sheppard
Barkley	George	Jones	Shortridge
Bingham	Gillett	Kean	Smith
Blaine	Glass	Kendrick	Smoot
Blease	Glenn	Keyes	Steck
Borah	Goff	La Follette	Steiwer
Bratton	Goldsborough	McCulloch	Stephens
Brookhart	Hale	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Broussard	Harris	McMaster	Townsend
Capper	Harrison	McNary	Trammell
Caraway	Hastings	Moses	Vandenberg
Connally	Hatfield	Norbeck	Walcott
Copeland	Hawes	Norris	Walsh, Mass.
Cutting	Hayden	Nye	Waterman
Deneen	Hebert	Oddie	Wheeler
Dill	Heflin	Robinson, Ind.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The pending amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the top of page 159 it is proposed to insert:

(c) Hose and half hose, in part of rayon or other synthetic textile, shall be classified under paragraph 1309.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, under section 1309 hose and half hose are dutiable at 65 per cent ad valorem, plus a specific duty of 45 cents per pound. It is obvious, therefore, that if subparagraph (c) is adopted, the rate of duty on hose and half hose in part of rayon will be very greatly increased.

The tariff act generally provides for a duty upon the chief value of the textile. This is a departure from the general rule obtaining in the tariff act.

It will be observed that if hose and half hose contain any part of rayon, they are classified under paragraph 1309 of the

rayon schedule. Of course, if hose and half hose in chief value of rayon were carried to the rayon schedule, there would be no objection. Inasmuch as that result can be achieved by a simple amendment when we reach paragraph 1309, I move that the Senate reject the amendment contained in subparagraph (c).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the question be put the other way—whether or not the amendment of the committee shall be agreed to.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 159, line 14, after the words "ad valorem," to insert "Shirts of cotton, 50 per cent ad valorem," so as to make the paragraph read:

PAR. 919. Clothing and articles of wearing apparel of every description, manufactured wholly or in part, wholly or in chief value of cotton, and not specially provided for, 37½ per cent ad valorem. Shirts of cotton, 50 per cent ad valorem. Shirt collars and cuffs, of cotton, not specially provided for, 30 cents per dozen pieces and 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to suggest an amendment to this amendment. After the word "cotton," on line 14, I move to insert "not knit or crocheted."

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator propose that amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; that language ought to be here. Unless it is here the shirt will fall under paragraph 917.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator is quite right about that.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Let the amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Utah to the amendment of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 159, line 14, in the matter proposed by the committee amendment, after the word "cotton," it is proposed to insert "not knit or crocheted."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to hear some explanation by the Senator from Utah in regard to this increase from 35 per cent ad valorem, the present law, to 50 per cent.

I understand the claim is made by the shirt manufacturers that the duty upon the fine cotton cloth from which shirts are made amounts to about 35 per cent ad valorem, and that therefore there is no compensatory or protective duty upon the labor involved in the manufacture of shirts from the fine yarn.

Mr. SMOOT. That is virtually the story.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I also understand that there is a good deal of difference about the imports. The Tariff Commission report the imports as negligible, but the Department of Commerce report them as very substantial. Whatever imports there are seem to be of the higher class shirts that would retail for about \$5. I certainly think the present rate is enough for the lower class shirts.

I would like to hear the Senator as to whether there should be a division of this duty so as to give some increase over the rate in the present law to the higher class, the more expensive shirts.

I certainly think the rate in the present law is ample for the cheaper and lower grade shirts, indeed, if it should not be reduced. I suggest to the Senator that he consider the possibility of reducing the duty upon shirts of the cheaper grade, of which there are no imports; or, if the number of imports alleged is true, possibly a slight increase might be justifiable.

Mr. SMOOT. Unless we put in the language "shirts of cotton," the article covered in this provision would fall back in the 37½ per cent bracket.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The rate in the present law?

Mr. SMOOT. The rate fixed by the House. That would take in nightshirts and numerous other items. Therefore we thought this one class of shirts, shirts of cotton—and they are the same style of shirt of which the Senator speaks—should bear the higher rate and leave the others just as the House provided.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Why is it that there is such a difference in the record of imports? The record of imports as submitted to us by the Tariff Commission for 1927 is 10,728 shirts, but some of the shirt manufacturers alleged that the Department of Commerce records show an importation of shirts to the value of \$500,000. What is the fact? Which is true?

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Department of Commerce is right, although I am not sure. The two sources of information have

kept the figures in different classifications. One has taken in shirts of all kinds, dyed shirts, fine shirts, and every kind of shirt, and the other has taken in cotton shirts, just the shirt commonly worn by men. That is the only way in which I can account for the difference.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Is it true that whatever imports there are consist of the fine-grade cotton-cloth shirts, such as the English embroidered shirts?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Is it true that the rate in the present law of 35 per cent ad valorem and the rate fixed by the House of 37½ per cent is only about the rate of protective duty upon that class of cloth, with no allowance for the workmanship in the making of the shirt?

Mr. SMOOT. That is what is claimed to be the fact. I really do not know whether that would cover the whole difference or not, but I say to the Senator that it is fine shirts that are provided for here.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. May I suggest to the Senator a lower rate upon the cheaper shirts than the rate in the present law, and, perhaps, a higher rate upon the higher-class shirts, if it is a fact that there are \$500,000 worth of the finer-grade shirts imported into the country?

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. DILL. Did I understand the Senator to say that it is proposed to increase the duty upon pyjamas and nightshirts, and shirts of that kind, and leave the tariff lower on the better-class shirts?

Mr. SMOOT. No; just the opposite. They are not classified in that way, and if we did not put in here the language "shirts of cotton," specifically mentioning them, they would all fall under the same rate, 37½ per cent.

Mr. DILL. Why raise the tariff?

Mr. SMOOT. That is a question for the Senate to decide.

Mr. DILL. It is a very high rate, it seems to me.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am sorry I could not hear the debate at the other end of the Chamber, and I would like to ask the Senator from Utah if this applies only to cotton shirts.

Mr. SMOOT. Just to cotton shirts.

Mr. COPELAND. Not to the fine grade of shirts?

Mr. SMOOT. It does relate to fine cotton shirts; and unless we put in this language here, the fine cotton shirts would fall in with those manufactured wholly or in chief value of cotton not specifically provided for; in other words, they would fall back into the basket clause at a lower rate of duty.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, can the Senator tell us what is the present rate on shirts?

Mr. SMOOT. Thirty-five per cent ad valorem.

Mr. WHEELER. The present rate is 35 per cent, and the committee has raised the rate on low-grade shirts to 37½ per cent.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The rate on all shirts, low grade and high grade, is 50 per cent. The low-grade shirts are largely made in prisons. There are no imports. It is alleged that there is an excessive amount of imports of the higher, finer-grade shirts, and the manufacturers allege that the duty upon these finer, higher-grade shirtings, if they buy them and make them into shirts, is 35 per cent ad valorem, and they get no protection for the labor. That is the claim, as I understand it. Am I correct?

Mr. SMOOT. That is the claim.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. There being no imports of the cheaper grades, they being largely prison made, it seems to me that the rate might well be lowered, and if it is a fact, as the Department of Commerce says, that the imports of the higher-grade shirts have reached the volume of \$500,000, perhaps a rate between 35 and 50 per cent might be arrived at on the finer-grade shirts.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether this does not illustrate the vice of pyramiding the tariff rates. It is claimed that because the shirtings, in the bolt, I presume, come over at a rate of 35 per cent, therefore when made into a shirt, it ought to bear a rate of 50 per cent. I do not understand that it costs any more to make a shirt out of a higher-grade material than it does to make one out of a lower-grade material.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think the Senator is mistaken about that. I think the labor in the making of the finer shirt costs more.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not in the proportion of the difference between 35 per cent and 50 per cent. There certainly is not that difference in the cost of making them. At this rate, if a

shirt might be regarded as a higher-grade shirt, selling at \$5, of course, the tariff would be \$2.50, making the cost \$7.50.

Of course, the importer and the wholesaler and the merchant get their share of a percentage based upon the total cost of the imported article, so that by the time the tariff is paid and all these percentages are paid, no one except an extremely wealthy person would be able to afford very many of these high-class shirts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The shirts which are coming in are luxury shirts. They retail for at least \$5 apiece, I am told, and the domestic manufacturers say they have to abandon all that business because they are unable to compete with the high-grade shirts from abroad.

I think it is important to determine here the fact as to what are the correct statistics. If they are as the Tariff Commission alleges, then there is no case for protection at all; but if they are as the Department of Commerce alleges, the unusually high sum of \$500,000, then it might be a matter we ought to consider, whether there should be some slight increase on that class of shirt. But certainly there is no case at all even for the 35 per cent rate on the cheaper shirts.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator that the difference between the amount of the importations in one case and the other is that in one case the shirts have been classified as wearing apparel, and in the other case they have been separated. That is where the difference comes, if there is any difference at all in the amount of importations.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Utah if it is not true that the duty on the finished garment is the duty not only on the material but on the cost of putting the material into the garment?

Mr. SMOOT. Speaking now of the shirt?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the only thing in controversy, as I understand it.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. So that if the material in the shirt is one-half the value of the garment the labor in the shirt really represents 75 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no.

Mr. GEORGE. At the rate of 37½ per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. That would be on the cloth alone, but of course the difference between making the shirt here and abroad is at least 50 per cent.

Mr. GEORGE. But take a case where the material in a foreign-made shirt represents one-half of the foreign value of the shirt as a finished garment. Then my statement would be accurate.

Mr. SMOOT. That is, provided we did not give any protection against the foreign maker. The foreign maker can make a shirt for at least one-half of what it can be made for in the United States, so it would be protecting the labor in the shirt and the cloth that is in the shirt because of the fact that it is a completed article. It is not only on the cloth in the shirt. This refers to shirts of cotton.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand this duty is levied on the shirt as a finished garment. That is the point I am making.

Mr. SMOOT. That is right.

Mr. GEORGE. It is not 37½ per cent upon the material in the shirt.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; this relates to a completed article.

Mr. GEORGE. It is on the finished garment.

Mr. SMOOT. On the finished garment.

Mr. GEORGE. Under the present law the rate is 35 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. The House increased it to 37½ per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

Mr. GEORGE. The manufacturers of fine shirts came before the committee and said, in effect, that the duty on shirts is less than the duty on the material, whereas the duty on the shirt as a finished garment is the duty on the material plus the workmanship in the material, and it did not occur to me that there should be any increase of the duty.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Georgia whether this \$500,000 represents the imports including the high-priced, the medium, and the low-priced shirts?

Mr. GEORGE. I am not able to answer that. I may be able to ascertain.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. There are no imports of the cheap, low-grade shirts. The great volume of those are produced in prisons and sold at prison-labor prices. The imports are entirely of the high-grade shirts.

Mr. BARKLEY. Assuming that \$5 be designated as the price of a high-grade shirt, and from that on up—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The retail price in the United States is about \$5.

Mr. BARKLEY. The figure given would represent in the neighborhood of 100,000 shirts imported into the United States.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The retail price in the United States is about \$5. These shirts come in all the way from less than \$1 to \$2.50, foreign valuation.

Mr. BARKLEY. A shirt that costs less than a dollar could not be described as a very high-priced shirt.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. They retail for a very high price; two or three times their import price.

Mr. BARKLEY. What I am trying to arrive at is the number of shirts that come in, in competition with the number of shirts we make in the United States. With 120,000,000 people in the United States and considering all the shirts that are worn by the American people and manufactured by the American people, \$500,000 worth of shirts, especially of the high-grade shirts, it occurs to me is an enormous amount of importations.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, the fact is that it is so small that it is negligible. Every man wears out three or four shirts a year, and there are 40,000,000 or 50,000,000 men in the country, so if we put the shirts at a value of \$1 there is \$1,500,000 at least, and a great outcry is made because there are so few imports of that kind of shirts.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, we ought to keep in mind the object that we want to attain. We have gone over the facts half a dozen times and everybody knows them by heart. There are a lot of cheap shirts that are worn by laboring men or poor men. We want to let the monopoly on this side of the tariff wall handle that business. We want to give it to them. We do not want to say so in so many words, because that would be deviating from the usual path that we take where we are going to levy a tariff for the benefit of labor. Here we are going to stick labor in the back with a knife. So we say let us levy this tariff because there are some rich men who import shirts, and everybody wants to stick the rich man, so we will levy a tariff of 50 per cent on shirts and the poor man "gets it in the shirt" in that way.

There is now a rate in effect which is almost an embargo to keep the cheap shirts out, but we want to raise it a little higher, so we can raise the price a little higher. Is not that plain? It is perfectly plain that we are using the rich man in this case as a dupe to get the knife into the poor man's shirt.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the importations as revealed are \$28,000 worth and the exportations are only \$1,500,000.

Mr. SMOOT. They are not the same kinds of shirts at all.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, as has been pointed out here to-day, we do not need any tariff on shirts at all. We can compete with England in the production of shirts and we can turn them out cheaper than they can be turned out any place else in the world. They are not stopped by any rate we may have on shirts, but Senators on the other side seem to be afraid that somebody will ship in a few shirts, so they want to put an embargo on the higher-priced shirts. What ought to be done, instead of raising this rate, is to strike out the whole paragraph and put shirts on the free list.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 160, paragraph 921, in line 2, the committee proposes to strike out "55 per cent" and insert "75 per cent," so as to read:

Rag rugs, wholly or in chief value of cotton, of the type commonly known as hit-and-miss, 75 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on this particular paragraph let me say that the Tariff Commission made an investigation of hit-and-miss rag rugs; that is, rugs made of rags and described as hit-and-miss rugs. After the investigation was made as to the cost of production in the United States and abroad in the chief importing country, the President approved of the finding of the commission, but inasmuch as the 50 per cent leeway under the tariff act did not permit him to take care of the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, he transferred the hit-and-miss rugs to the American valuation.

Mr. SMOOT. At the same rate.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; at the same rate. I believe that rate was 35 per cent, if I recollect correctly. Thirty-five per cent based on the American selling price is equivalent to about 117 per cent on the foreign value, so that the Senate Finance Committee in this paragraph simply followed the recommendations of the Tariff Commission in part; that is to say, they agreed upon a rate of 75 per cent ad valorem upon the hit-and-miss rug, but an ad valorem rate as proclaimed by the President

would really have been a rate in excess of 100 per cent or about 117 per cent, as I recollect it. In this particular case the commission made a study as to the cost, and the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad was ascertained. I see no reason why the Senate committee amendment might not be agreed to because it seems to be based on the actual difference in the cost of production.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the Senator whether there are any exports of these carpets? Evidently they are a poor man's carpet.

Mr. GEORGE. They are not carpets, I will say to the Senator. They are rugs. I do not think there are any exports. There are pretty heavy imports perhaps from Japan.

Mr. SACKETT. Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senate committee will be granted in this particular case because this kind of rug had its origin and early manufacture in the Appalachian Mountains. Small factories were established in a few towns, one or two in western Pennsylvania, one or two in Kentucky, and, I think, one farther south, to make the warp, which was then sold out to the people in the mountain cabins in the Appalachian Mountains, and the rugs were poked through the warp and made into the rag rugs. It became quite an industry. In those mountain cabins there were established the little machines to pull the rags through the warp.

Suddenly the importations began from Japan. I was interested in it because of the factories in my State where the sale of the warp fell off. They began to look into it and found the Japanese rugs coming in and selling for very much less than they could afford to sell for. It practically destroyed the labor which was carried on in those mountain districts. I do not think it could be built up again because the length of time the Tariff Commission had to take to find the difference in the cost of production in America and in Japan was so great that the importations coming from Japan practically drove the business away from that territory. I think that indicates rather clearly that a tariff of considerable size is necessary if we are going to consider production in this country.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SACKETT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Where are the factories now that made these rugs?

Mr. SACKETT. I know of one at Maysville, Ky., that has gone into making other things. It did not make the rugs. It made the warp and sold the warp to the people who lived in the mountains.

Mr. McKELLAR. But where are the rugs made now? Who was before the committee asking to have the tariff increased?

Mr. SACKETT. There was one man named Lovejoy, but he did not give very much information. The way that I happened to know about it is that they appealed to me to assist them through the Tariff Commission at the time, and that was several years ago.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, it is very apparent that this is a poor man's rug. Evidently the case that was made out before the Finance Committee for the increase of duty was poor, because there was not a particle of testimony or evidence, figures, or facts given to the committee which would seem to justify an increase of any kind.

Mr. SACKETT. No; there was not. The reason for it is, if the Senator will listen a moment, that the whole matter was gone into by the Tariff Commission and a study made, but the people who made these rugs were not people who could afford to come here to Washington at all. They were poor people who lived in the mountains. They pulled the rags through the warp. That is all they did for their living. They are out of it now. I do not think it makes much difference to them whether we put a duty on or not, but the entire business will go by the board if we do not have a duty.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, there is another paragraph later on in the bill that I think applies to the rugs the Senator from Kentucky is talking about and that this paragraph has no application at all. Paragraph 1021, on page 168, reads as follows:

PAR. 1021. Common China, Japan, and India straw matting and floor coverings made therefrom, 3 cents per square yard; carpets, carpeting, mats, matting, and rugs, wholly or in chief value of flax, hemp, or jute, or a mixture thereof, 35 per cent ad valorem; all other floor coverings not specially provided for, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. That does not apply to cotton cloth. It comes under flax and hemp.

Mr. NORRIS. Are the rugs that have been coming from Japan cotton rag rugs?

Mr. SMOOT. They are cotton warp.

Mr. SACKETT. Hit-and-miss rugs of any kind.

Mr. SMOOT. But they are cotton warp.

Mr. NORRIS. There is nothing about warp here.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, yes; it provides "where the chief value is of hemp," and not only that, but in the hit-and-miss rug paragraph the filling must be cotton as well. They are hit-and-miss cotton rugs.

Mr. NORRIS. Here is the way it reads:

Rag rugs, wholly or in chief value of cotton, of the type commonly known as hit-and-miss, 55 per cent.

The committee proposes to strike out 55 per cent and insert 75 per cent. There is nothing there about warp.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, they must have the warp.

Mr. NORRIS. I know that, but the Senator was speaking of the kind of warp they must have. There is nothing in this paragraph that designates the kind of warp.

Mr. SMOOT. It is the cotton paragraph.

Mr. NORRIS. But it does not say that the warp would have to be cotton. It might be silk.

Mr. SMOOT. It says "wholly or in chief value of cotton, of the type commonly known as hit-and-miss."

Mr. NORRIS. They could have some other kind of warp in that kind of a rug, and it would bear this tariff, as I read it.

Mr. SMOOT. No; it would not.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course the Senator from Utah is a pretty good lawyer and knows how to construe language. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. SMOOT. I know what the intention is.

Mr. NORRIS. When it says "rag rugs, wholly or in chief value of cotton," it does not follow, it seems to me, that the warp would have to be a rag or the warp would have to be a cotton rag. It could not be a rag. They could not make a warp of rags. That would not work. They could not make any rug out of it. While the warp might be cotton, there is nothing here that says it shall be cotton.

Mr. SMOOT. It says the chief value shall be cotton.

Mr. NORRIS. That is the chief value of the rug and not the warp.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I want to interrupt the Senator from Nebraska merely to suggest that under the present law, which is paragraph 1022 of the act of 1922, these cotton rugs are in the same category with hemp, jute, and flax, so they are all taxed alike. In the present bill an effort has been made to separate cotton rugs from hemp, jute, and flax rugs, so probably that contributes to the confusion which the Senator finds in the present bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 160, line 4, before the words "ad valorem," to strike out "45 per cent" and insert "35 per cent," so as to read:

Chenille rugs, wholly or in chief value of cotton, 35 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, there seems to be a little confusion about rag rugs. "Hit-and-miss" rag rugs was a subject of very careful and exhaustive study by the Tariff Commission. It was found that the actual difference in the cost of producing that type of rug in the United States and Japan was approximately 117 per cent. Of course, the President could not increase the rate to 117 per cent, so he adopted the American selling price.

When the Finance Committee reached paragraph 921 they recommended a rate of 75 per cent, although a rate that would have fully equalized the difference in the cost of production would have been in excess of 100 per cent.

The making of this character of rugs is quite an industry. It is strictly and peculiarly a mountain industry. Some factories, however, have made this type of rug or they have made materials for the rug. The next type of rug in this paragraph which is now before the Senate is the chenille rug. I direct the Senate's attention to the fact that the House recommended a 45 per cent ad valorem duty on chenille rugs; the duty in the cotton schedule on all chenilles is 50 per cent, so that we have the peculiar situation that in the case of a rug which carried a duty of 45 per cent under the House bill the Senate Committee on Finance

has further reduced the duty to 35 per cent *al valorem*, although the duty on chenilles—that is, on the cloth—is 50 per cent.

The producers of this article very earnestly insisted that the duty on chenille rugs ought to be left at 45 per cent, but the Senate Finance Committee recommended a reduction to 35 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senate Finance Committee went back to the rate of 35 per cent, which is the rate provided in the existing law. The Finance Committee tried to find out the amount of importations, but records have not been kept in such a way as to disclose the figures as to the importations of the particular commodity. The committee was informed, however, that importations are very slight. That is the reason why the committee went back to the rate of the existing law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 160, after line 7, to insert:

PAR. 922. Rags wholly or in chief value of cotton, except those chiefly used in paper making, 3 cents per pound.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment, as I understand, is to drive the public to the use of cotton thread waste instead of cotton wipers which are more commonly used and which are more suitable for the purposes of cleansing machinery. If this amendment shall be adopted, it will put a tax on every automobile owner and every garage, on every mill, and every factory in the United States. I do not know how greatly inclined Senators may be to permit such a thing to be done.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will permit me, I desire to say that we have just voted to tax every poor home whose occupants want the comfort of having on the floor a rug made of rags. We have no manufacturers in this country who produce them. Other countries produce them and send them over in such quantities that the ordinary home can have them; yet, in order to encourage somebody to make such rugs we vote to impose a high rate of duty on them, and thus make those who are not really able to afford it pay the extra cost or do without them.

Now, we come to a point where we are going to lay a tax on every man who has a machine and wants to use the ordinary rags or waste for the purpose of cleansing it. We have not failed in this bill to put a duty on everything that anybody uses. We have put a duty on toothpicks and the little skewers that are stuck through meat and also on clothespins. I repeat, we have not left a thing out of the bill which the American consuming public uses. Not only is there the same old dragnet provision as in the act of 1922 but an additional tax in the face of the most demoralizing conditions that the ordinary consuming public have seen in the history of this country. Yet we sit here on this side and vote for these monstrous propositions.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is not present at the moment. I should say that we have an addition to the consumers' bloc. The Senator from Massachusetts and I have been quite alone in representing the consumer, but now the Senator from South Carolina has joined us, and I am very happy, indeed, that we have a convert.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I can not let the last remark of the Senator go without an answer. He must not call me a "convert." I have sat here quietly and acquiesced in the action of the representatives of this side of the Chamber managing the tariff bill, but I have had to pinch myself to discover whether I was on this side of the aisle or on the other side of the aisle. I want the Senator from New York to understand that for 21 years I have been a Democrat, actively in this body. I, perhaps, have not done my duty as I should have done it; but I have been loyal to the principles of my party, among which is that we should have a tariff for revenue, with incidental protection, it is true, but not for the purpose of putting an embargo on everything and a burden on the American people from toothpicks to steam engines.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator and am delighted to know that he is one of the original apostles. I am going to join him, but it is time, I may say to the Senator from South Carolina, that somebody on this side, in fact, many of us on this side, as well as on the other side, should stand up here and speak for the people.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know of anybody in the Chamber who has asked for higher rates of duty than has the Senator from

New York, and if he wants to know specific instances I will give him a list of them.

Mr. SMITH. Perhaps the Senator from New York is a convert.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read a letter from the Louisville Sanitary Wipers Co., which explains this amendment in language which I think will convince the Senate that it ought not to be adopted.

Mr. COPELAND. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought the Senator had yielded the floor.

Mr. COPELAND. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

LOUISVILLE, KY., September 19, 1929.

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are writing to you protesting against the enactment of paragraph 922 in the proposed tariff bill as amended by the Finance Committee of the Senate. Under the language of this paragraph a duty of 3 cents per pound is imposed on shipments of old cotton rags entering the United States, which includes all grades of wiping rags, whether these be the washed sterilized wipers or raw material which consists of unwashed and untrimmed wiping rags.

A conservative estimate of the percentage of this country's requirements of wiping rags which are imported is 50 per cent. Therefore, if this paragraph is passed as proposed, foreign wiping rags will be kept out of this country entirely, causing a considerable rise in price and undoubtedly a serious shortage. Eventually wiping rags would be too high in competition with other commodities and the consumer would be forced to turn to some other products for their wiping needs.

The duty as proposed would assist only a small group of manufacturers of new towels or cloths, whereas it would harm and injure thousands upon thousands of consumers of wipers in various lines of industry, as well as dealers and launderers of wiping rags.

It would cause thousands of poor men and women between the ages of 50 and 70, who are engaged in this industry, to be thrown out of employment. Thousands of elderly women are employed by wiping-rag factories, these women being unable to do any other kind of work. These elderly people would become a charge upon the public and depend on charity for assistance.

We are in favor of a reasonable duty, and suggest your recommending 1 cent per pound for all wiping rags unwashed and 2 cents for the finished product, or washed and sterilized, trimmed wiping rags. Such a duty would not interfere with the many wiping-rag factories in this country who, aside from employing many thousands of people, also have large amounts invested in equipment.

Higher duty will undoubtedly force the market in this country upward, as supply of wiping rags of domestic origin are below the demand, with the result that ultimately various industrial concerns will be charged much higher prices. This industry objects to, as already, the price for old washed wiping rags is high enough, and further advances will tend to discourage the use, with the result that manufacturing plants such as ours, which are situated in most industrial cities throughout the United States, will suffer materially.

Your vote against this paragraph as proposed will prevent the chaotic situation which will result if it is enacted.

Very truly yours,

LOUISVILLE SANITARY WIPERS CO.,
D. H. SILVERSTEIN, Vice President.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am sorry the Senator from Utah did not read the list of articles upon which I am in favor of putting a tariff duty. I am willing to have a tariff put on \$6 neckties, but not on wiping rags and other things that are used, as these humble articles are used, in every factory, in every mill, in every garage, and by everybody having occasion to clean a machine. It is outrageous to think that they appear in the bill at all, and I am perfectly willing to be found in opposition to this particular amendment, even though I do occasionally vote for a tariff on \$6 neckties.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not want the impression to go out that the Senator from New York only votes for increases in tariff duties on \$6 neckties. I would prefer to wait until we get to some of the other schedules before giving the list. I might, however, offhand, mention brick; I might mention gypsum and a number of other things without going through the RECORD. If, however, the Senator wants me to do so, I will go through the RECORD and put the list in the RECORD to-morrow.

Mr. COPELAND. I will be delighted to have the Senator put them in the RECORD, because the things that he has specified I am glad to stand for.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. COPELAND. And I can give abundant reasons for my position, but I am not one to stand on this floor and vote to

increase the cost of living in every home in America, while the Senator from Utah is a conspicuous example of those who are willing to do that very thing.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I desire to know whether the tax imposed in this item will increase the consumption of cotton.

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; I do not think it will. These are the rags. I may say that the rate under existing law is 20 per cent. If this amendment is rejected, these cotton rags will go back into the basket clause, from which they have been taken, at 20 per cent; and that will be equivalent to practically 1 cent or 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to ask the Senator from Utah the equivalent ad valorem of 3 cents per pound on these rags.

Mr. SMOOT. It is between 50 and 60 per cent.

Mr. McKELLAR. In other words, it will raise the tariff on these rags from 20 per cent to 50 or 60 per cent?

Mr. SMOOT. There were imported into this country from Japan last year 30,927,000 pounds.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do.

Mr. BINGHAM. May I have the attention of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]?

I thought I had on my desk a copy of the hearings before the subcommittee of which the Senator from Georgia and I were both members, but I do not find it here. I desire to ask the Senator from Georgia whether he recollects who it was that appeared before the subcommittee and said that he had a large plant engaged in manufacturing wipers, particularly for use on automobiles, and that his business was being seriously interfered with by the importation of rags from Japan. My recollection is that it was in accordance with the representations made by that witness that the committee voted to put on this duty. Does the Senator remember?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, my recollection is that Mr. Lovejoy, representing the Valway Rug Mills, of Lagrange, Ga., and others, appeared.

The Senator's recollection is correct. The waste-rag industry has grown into a considerable industry. This industry, of course, makes use of the wastage about cotton mills—the waste products, so to speak. It does not necessarily mean a useless or worthless product, but it is waste so far as general manufacturing is concerned.

These mills are now making the cotton wiping rags. The showing made before the committee was to the effect that rags of all kinds and characters were brought in largely from Japan, I believe, and that the domestic industry was unable to meet that competition.

With reference to this specific rate, I should say that of course there ought not to be any disposition to exclude or to make dutiable rags used for paper-making purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. They are on the free list.

Mr. GEORGE. I was much impressed with the suggestion made in the letter which the Senator from Kentucky sent to the desk, and which was read by the clerk, suggesting a change in the rate on these rags. It was a material reduction, as I recollect, from the Senate committee's recommendation. At the same time it was, perhaps, some increase over the rate in the present law.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. Can we not agree, then, upon the paragraph as it is written, in order that we may know for the future just what the importations are, and the value of them, with whatever decrease the Senator wishes from the 3 cents, but leave the paragraph in for that purpose, if for no other, so as to take it out of the basket clause? Then hereafter we will know just what the valuations of the importations were.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama further yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have found the hearings now. I should like to say to the Senator from Georgia that Mr. Lovejoy, representing the Valway Rug Mills, of Lagrange, Ga., asked for a minimum of 5 cents per pound, and stated that they had lost

about \$100,000 in their effort to make these rags. The committee did not grant the 5 cents a pound requested.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the Senator what is the price of the rags? Does he give the price of the rags per pound? It did not amount to 5 cents, did it? Was it not less than 5 cents?

Mr. BINGHAM. The testimony was that the cloth sells at 30 cents a pound. The rags imported, which are about 30,000,000 pounds, apparently, sell for from 6 to 10 cents a pound. The testimony given by Mr. Lovejoy, of Georgia, was, in answer to a question, that the wiping rags which their company made were durable, and therefore, if they could get this protection, they could sell them even at a much higher price than the Japanese rags that come in, because they would last that much longer.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I venture to say that the rags do not cost 5 cents a pound in this country. I am quite sure that those who furnish the rags, the various ragpickers of the country, do not pay as much as that for them.

Mr. SACKETT, Mr. BINGHAM, and Mr. GOFF addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama further yield; and to whom?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. SACKETT. I simply desire to say that on page 43 of the hearings the same witness testified that they sell for from 6 to 10 cents a pound.

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes; that is what I said—that the rags sell for from 6 to 10 cents a pound.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to inquire of the Senator from Connecticut if the concerns that make these rags as a sort of by-product of waste have not received increased rates on the main product that goes from their factories, and are now seeking to tax in the same proportion the rags that are a part of the waste of their factories?

Mr. BINGHAM. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to answer that question. I am not familiar with the matter, because the only factory whose representative appeared before us was the Georgia factory.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not speaking of Mr. Lovejoy. I think it would be inconceivable to levy a tax here for the benefit of one man located anywhere.

Mr. BINGHAM. It does not make any difference to me whether one man is making these rags or 1,000 people are making them, or whether the industry is situated in 1 State or in 10 States.

If an industry has been set up, and millions of dollars have been put in it, and it was doing fairly well, and imports began to come in and destroy the business, so that the industry has lost \$100,000, I think it ought to be protected, whether one person or a thousand persons are concerned in the industry.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thoroughly understand the Senator's attitude; but my information is that the domestic product of wiping rags, which is a waste product, is able to supply only one-half the demand of the American people; and the question is whether we are going to increase the cost of this article, which is necessary in order to cleanse machinery of all kinds, by an increase of almost 300 per cent in the tariff.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. GOFF. I desire at this time very briefly to submit a very concise analysis of this situation made by L. A. Pollock & Co., of Huntington, W. Va. It occurs to me, after listening to the suggestions that have been made and the arguments advanced, that this analysis is very appealing.

Mr. Pollock states that there is no definite line of demarcation between old cotton rags and linen rags for paper making, which are free and always have been free in the importations into this country. He says that they still come from the same sources, and that they are handled in the same manner; and that attempting to make old rags for paper making free—now, these are the old rags for paper making—and old cotton rags not chiefly used for paper making dutiable, is opening the door to endless confusion, injustice, and great expense to the American consumer.

If we take paragraph 922, and read it in the light of that analysis, we have—

Rags wholly or in chief value of cotton, except those chiefly used in paper making, 3 cents per pound.

It has occurred to me, and I am therefore going to offer this amendment, that paragraph 922 should be amended so as to read:

Rags wholly or in chief value of cotton, free.

That, of course, would close the door to any confusion, or to the necessity of passing upon and determining the difference between old rags and old cotton rags not chiefly used for paper making; and it seems to me that the amendment of the committee as it is now presented is open to that confusion.

I therefore offer, as an amendment to the committee amendment, paragraph 922:

Rags wholly or in chief value of cotton, free.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, it has been suggested here—

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. While we are on this subject, I desire to make a suggestion to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff]. If the Senator desires to accomplish just what he has stated, this material should be left on the free list.

Mr. GOFF. Exactly.

Mr. SMOOT. When we reach the free list, his suggestion could be acted upon in the regular order.

Mr. GOFF. If that is more agreeable to the Senator from Utah, and with the understanding that we shall let it go until we reach the free list, I am perfectly willing to adopt that course.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. If that is the case, then let us reject this amendment.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, we are told that this is a new industry in the United States, and that these rags are not supplied in sufficient abundance to meet the demand. That is the first time I have heard that suggestion made. I think if we encourage this industry we can supply it very easily.

A great many people do not know that there is a market for the rags that are now thrown away. I submit that Congress ought to encourage industry of every kind. If these rags are coming in here in abundance, and are affecting very materially and injuriously the market in the United States, why should we not come to the rescue of these producers of cotton rags? It aids the cotton producer. If his cotton is made into cloth, and when it becomes worn somewhat, the person owning the cloth knows that there is a market for the rags and for this waste material, he will bundle it up and send it to that market; but if we permit rags to come in here in abundance from foreign countries and take the home market away from these people, we discourage them from going to the market place at all with their substance, and they throw it away. It does indeed then become waste material to them.

Germany won fame the world over by utilizing everything produced in the German Empire, and if she had not made the mistake of going into the World War, she would still be leading all the nations of the earth. We are comparatively a young republic. Surely we are not ready to throw away these markets to which our people are entitled. Let us give them a little aid in this case. I am going to vote for an increase in this rate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the Senate committee amendment. In line 9, I move to strike out "3 cents per pound" and in lieu thereof to insert "if unwashed, 1 cent per pound, if washed, sterilized, and trimmed, 2 cents per pound."

It strikes me that probably there is some reason for a difference between the tariff on unwashed rags that come in and the tariff on those where the necessary labor has been applied to them to wash and sterilize them and trim them. In accordance with that theory, I offer the amendment to put a 1-cent duty on the unwashed and 2 cents on the washed, sterilized, and trimmed.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I believe that is a distinction which should be made. According to the information I have, it costs a cent to do the washing and trimming mentioned by the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that is a fair difference between the cost of preparing and sterilizing these rags and sending them over unwashed. I understand the Senator from Georgia suggested that that amendment would be agreeable to him.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Georgia, who has this schedule in charge, the reason for the exception in paragraph 922, relating to rags chiefly used in paper making, 3 cents per pound. Are rags used chiefly for paper making on the free list?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; they are on the free list.

Mr. SMITH. Why are they on the free list? Are they not rags of practically the same nature as the others?

Mr. GEORGE. No; they are not of the same nature, although some rags might be used interchangeably. The rags used for paper making are not, as a rule, of that kind.

Mr. SMITH. But they are imported?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. It is very well, I think, for us to insist that some protection should be given to southern cotton mills which are making these wiping towels, which buy their machinery, build their houses, carry on their business, in a tariff-protected country. They have several million dollars invested in these plants to use waste products. If we were on a free-trade basis, of course, nobody would insist that there be any protection given, but if our mills are to utilize their waste material, it is essential for them to have a reasonable degree of protection.

Mr. SMITH. Is not that true of cotton mills?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Not of the southern cotton mills alone, but of all cotton mills?

Mr. GEORGE. I think so.

Mr. SMITH. It is the same principle which has distinguished the Democratic Party from the Republican Party through all these years. Some one has said that the tariff is a local issue.

Mr. NORRIS. That is not true of all rags. There is a difference in rags.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; there is a difference in rags.

Mr. NORRIS. What the Senator has said is true, but it does not apply to all rags.

Mr. SMITH. No.

Mr. GEORGE. There is a difference in rags, of course. But the rags used for paper making are on the free list, and they remain on the free list under this amendment. That might result in a difficulty in the administration of the law.

Mr. SMOOT. No, it would make no difference at all.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know; I say it might result in an administrative difficulty. I do not know about that.

Mr. SMOOT. Paper rags are always in small pieces, which can not be used for anything else. They are never larger than half the size of one's hand. These whitening rags about which we are talking are pieces out of which wiping rags can be made. There is no trouble whatever in the classification. Paper-making rags have been on the free list, and they are on the free list under the pending bill.

Mr. SMITH. So far as the principle involved in this matter is concerned, I can not understand why rags used for paper making are put on the free list, whether they are imported or whether they are not, and rags that are used by all those who use machinery, and who must keep it in good condition are taxed. The railroads use millions of pounds in their journals, and there are millions of pounds used on machines of various kinds. Why should we tax the character of rags used in industry, such as I have indicated, these wiping rags, and yet place those used for paper making on the free list?

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I think the Senator from Utah is misinformed. It happens that these paper rags very frequently have large pieces of cloth in them, and they are picked over. Those pieces are often taken out from the paper stock, and, as the Senator from Georgia has hinted, it would make it extremely difficult to administer the law if there were in it any distinction such as is proposed here.

Mr. SMITH. I see that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to ask the Senator from Utah why these rags are put on the free list if paper is made out of them? At whose instance were they put upon the free list?

Mr. SMOOT. They have always been on the free list.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know that, but why have they always been on the free list?

Mr. SMOOT. They are not used for any other purpose. They are perfectly useless unless they are used for paper-making purposes.

Mr. SMITH. Is there not some domestic production of rags, so that some one in this country could be found who could make some money if we would raise the duty high enough so that they could be sold for paper-making purposes?

Mr. SMOOT. Not that I know of.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I can not understand any such position. There is a production of rags in the United States. Some are used for paper making, some are used for another purpose. A tariff is put on one, and is not put on the other. Why is that?

Mr. SMOOT. For the simple reason that the paper-making rags can not be used for any other purpose.

Mr. SMITH. The paper-making rags could be used for the purpose of making the wipers.

Mr. SMOOT. No, Senator.

Mr. SMITH. They are shredded. I know how they are made. They are made down in my section of the country. No one can come and tell me all sorts of rags can not be used in this sweating process to make the material used for wiping purposes, and the little towels that are used—the little crash towels with which all of us are familiar.

Mr. SMOOT. The wiper is made from a rag. Perhaps one could take a soft cotton and use that over by spinning another thread, the same as is done with wool, but even that is not done in the United States. The labor forms too large a part of the cost. It is done in the case of wool.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, a man appeared from the State of the Senator from Georgia, who has a factory which, as a by-product, is making these other wipers.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no, Mr. President; it is not a by-product. That is a separate and distinct industry, for the purpose of utilizing what otherwise is a waste product. I do not want the Senator to get the impression that it is a by-product.

Mr. SMITH. May I ask the Senator from Georgia this question: How many factories of that character are there in this country?

Mr. GEORGE. I can not answer that. The witness who appeared before the committee said that he appeared for himself and others interested in the manufacture of so-called wiping rags.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I want to conclude what I have to say about this business.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me bring this to the attention of the Senator. The value of rags for paper-making purposes, I am advised on inquiry, is about 1.9 cents a pound, while the other rags which can be used for wiping rags have an import value of 5 cents a pound. Therefore it follows that the man who has rags to sell on the other side of the world will sort them, and will not send anything over for paper-making purposes at 1.9 cents, for which he could get 5 cents a pound. If that is true, it seems to me that the classification is a practical one, and one which will not result in very much administrative difficulty.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me to ask the Senator from Georgia a question?

Mr. SMITH. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not true that the reason why the small or inferior rags are put on the free list is so that the great paper makers of the country can get a large part of their raw material as cheaply as possible? Is not that the plain truth of the matter?

Mr. GEORGE. I suppose that has much to do with it. They want these rags, of course. They are a very cheap product, and they are on the free list. They are on the free list under the present act, and under the amendment.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, all of us are aware of the fact that at this time the use of this peculiar product is universal. Everybody must have it. We are not proposing to put a reasonable duty on it, but something over 100 per cent. In order that perhaps somebody in the United States, at some time, may see an opportunity to make a tremendous profit out of the necessities of the millions of people who use these rags, we are going to impose a tax on this necessary article, not because there are a great number of men engaged in the production of it whose business life and whose investments are jeopardized, but simply because one concern appears and says it might interfere with its profits, a million, two million, three million, four million, or five million Americans are to be mulcted with a duty of 100 or 150 per cent on a necessary article. That is the proposition before us.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, how does the Senator get the idea of a tariff of 100 or 150 per cent when the duty asked for is 3 cents a pound, and it has been stated several times on the

floor that the rags cost from 6 to 10 cents a pound? That is the evidence. Where does the Senator get the idea of 150 per cent?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the original cotton does not cost much more than 10 cents a pound. The floors of the factories are swept and the waste incident to converting the staple into goods is taken, and it probably does not cost 1 cent a pound. Millions and millions of pounds of this waste over a period of years are swept up from the floors of the different cotton factories and saved as waste and converted into this waste material.

Speaking about it costing 5 or 10 cents a pound, the original goods out of which you get the rags and waste does not cost that amount. It is a waste material. Where does anyone get the idea of 10 cents a pound? It was an arbitrary estimate of some individual in order to get a tariff that would spell an inordinate profit to the individual who makes the article.

It does seem to me that the time has come when some one on this side, at least, should have some regard for the millions of people who use the ordinary products that we so abundantly produce.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, as I understand it a protective tariff is for the purpose of increasing production in our country, so we are going to levy a protective tariff on rags to increase the production of rags in this country. The best rag factories I know of in the country are some very poor families with 10 or 12 or 14 children. In the course of a year there are more rags produced there than any place else I know of. When we say we are going to increase the production of rags we say in effect that we want our people to be ragged. Is the Senate spending its time—is this great group of statesmen spending its time levying a tariff on rags?

According to the pending amendment we are going to levy a different tariff upon clean rags than we levy upon dirty rags. If the rags are dirty, we will not charge as much as when they are clean. If they are dirty and liable to bring in disease so as to give business to the doctors and druggists, we let them in cheap, but if they are clean and sterilized and there is nothing insanitary about them, so there is no opportunity for us to do anything with them on that account, we charge a higher rate.

We are levying a tariff on rags, Mr. President. The idea is to produce more rags. Rags and poverty usually go together. We ought not to levy a tariff on rags so as to pay our people something for living in a condition of poverty. The more abject the poverty is the more rags we will have. What are we going to do with the poor devil who comes over here as an immigrant and when he comes into this country wears old clothes? That is where we usually get our rags, from old clothes. I suppose our immigration inspectors, if we pass the kind of a law that levies a heavy tariff upon rags, will be watching the incoming steamers and every poor fellow who has not a spick and span clean looking suit of clothes will be grabbed and his clothes will be taken off of him. [Laughter.] He will be compelled to pay a tariff on his old clothes because they are rags. We are going to encourage rags in this country by levying a protective tariff on rags.

The reason why we levy a tariff on steel products is in order that we may have more steel products manufactured. If we want to have more rags let us put a high tariff on rags that are coming in and thus develop the rag industry in the United States.

Mr. President, does the Senate of the United States want to do that? Is it necessary that we should by law organize a lot of ragamuffins in the country and give them an inducement to be ragged, to go into the rag business, to tear their clothes as well as their hair? In other words, do we want to develop the rag industry? If we do, I do not believe we can do it by putting a tariff on rags, because we usually put on the high tariffs in the name of labor, and where will there be more labor benefited by levying a tariff on rags? Where will there be more men, women, and children benefited?

Of course, this is something at which the children are experts—rag making. A good, healthy American boy can produce more rags than a man who is 50 years old and has been in the business for 50 years. If we put a tariff on rags, do we expect that we are going to increase the rag business? Are we going to make the people more ragged if we give them enough money so they can afford to be ragged? Are we not carrying the protective-tariff principle a little bit to extremes? Would it not be well to try to have prosperity and good business; and, if we need rags, let us look to the fellows who are not prosperous to supply them and let them come in cheap from abroad?

If rags are used for making paper, they are admitted free. If a man takes his old coat, which becomes a rag after awhile, and makes paper of it and if he brings it in for that purpose he does not pay any tariff; but if he uses that same old coat to

wipe the dust or the mud or the grease off of his Ford car he has to pay a tariff of 60 per cent in order to bring it in to do that work. It would seem that the object of the law is to prevent the people from destroying their old clothes in that way and to educate them along the lines that they should not wear their old clothes for such dirty purposes but should wear them a little longer and not call them rags but call them coats or something of the kind.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Utah what tariff is placed upon woolen rags, if any?

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is 24 cents a pound.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, in regard to woolen waste and woolen rags, it will be found that they are taxed nearly as high as raw wool. Virgin wool takes a tax of 31 cents a pound. I do not care whether this duty on cotton rags is continued or not, but the object of the tariff is not to make people wear rags. The Senator from Nebraska may use his shirt to wipe his automobile as much as he pleases and no one will object. There is a duty now on rags. I found it here when I came into the Senate.

The object of this tariff is to enable the cotton mills to utilize what otherwise is a waste product that goes to waste. That is the only purpose. If the duty should not be imposed, it would make no difference to me; and, if the duty is too high, it should be reduced; but when we get into the textiles and begin to take all the duties off of waste we are going to run into trouble before we get through the woolen schedule, because it will be found that woolen waste is taxed at about 24 cents a pound. It seems that the tariff on rags might remain in the bill so as to draw attention to the fact that we are providing a classification for these rags so that we may know what we are doing in the making of tariff rates.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator from Utah to say that there is a tariff on woolen rags?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; there is a tariff on woolen rags and I can explain it to the Senator, if he wants an explanation, when the schedule is reached, or briefly I could state it now.

Mr. McKELLAR. Just in a word now, are they on the free list or are they not?

Mr. SMOOT. There are certain rags on the free list and certain rags that are dutiable. Let me tell the Senator the situation and he can see what it is. Where we take a piece of woolen cloth and make a suit or a dress or a sweater, in making those articles there are always clippings sometimes of 10 inches, sometimes 4 inches, sometimes more or less. Europe takes all of our old waste; I mean the dirty waste; but these clippings are gathered all over the world and come in here. They are then garnetted and made into wool that is almost equal to the scoured wool itself.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does that come in free or is there a tariff on it?

Mr. SMOOT. There is a tariff on it.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is all I want to know.

Mr. SMOOT. That can not be done with cotton waste. We can take these rags and run them through a garnetted machine, and the machine will pick out the fibers in many cases, particularly with the soft rags, such as knit stockings, sweaters, and so forth, that are made here, and from those clippings produce a product just as good for use in the making of woolen rags up to 44's as if we had the clean, scoured wool.

Mr. McKELLAR. The reason why I asked about woolen rags or the clippings the Senator just spoke of is that during the war there was an investigation of the uniforms provided for our soldiers, and it was found that a great many of the uniforms were being made out of cloth coming from rag clippings—shoddy, in other words. It will be remembered that the Congress directed that that should not be done. I was wondering if they are now coming in free and the manufacturers are reaping the profits, as they will do in case these rags come in free.

Mr. SMOOT. I will state the way the Government does now. It does not buy a piece of cloth for a uniform of any kind unless it specifically provides that the tensile strength of the cloth shall be so much. It is the duty of those who examine the cloth as it is purchased by the Government to see that the tensile strength of every piece of cloth is determined by a test. I will say to the Senator that with the instruments we now have, they can test the cloth to a fraction of a degree. If waste is put into the cloth, it is impossible to maintain that required strength, and therefore under the examination by the Government to-day it is impossible for them to use anything but standard material.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was brought about by a law enacted during the war.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, during the war there were a lot of things that passed almost without inspection here, not only of

woolen goods, but cotton goods and every other kind of goods that were not up to standard. The whole cry was to "Make, make, get them here," and, of course, the Government of the United States took things that they would not take under ordinary circumstances.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, I have always had the highest respect for the judgment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and I have followed him in cotton legislation ordinarily, but I think he is entirely wrong in this matter. Woolen clippings sent here 5 or 6 inches long are much longer than any one fiber in the wool. We can make as good a sweater or as good clothes from those clippings as from the whole cloth.

There is a small duty proposed here for cotton waste. Much of it is wasted, as we know, in the machine shop and in the different usages in industrial activities of the South. There is no reason why we should turn down 3 cents a pound on that waste. It seems to me we ought to ask for an increase. I favor a protection for the wool people, and I certainly would protest against putting the waste of the cotton people on the free list.

I think the Senator from South Carolina, who is usually right on cotton questions of any kind, is entirely wrong here. I would like to see the 3-cent rate sustained by the Senate, if not increased.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is entirely right in one aspect of his argument, and that is that the United States should not become a dumping ground for the rags of the world. We certainly ought to keep those rags out. We do not want to have the waste material and refuse of other countries dumped in here for our people to wear and use. We have waste material of our own. Let us use it to advantage.

The Senator from Georgia has pointed out that there is a vast amount of waste cotton material around the various cotton factories of the country, both North and South. Why not utilize it, Senators? Why not create a demand for it in this country? Why not permit the cotton mills to sell this waste material to the people of the United States? We are demanding better wages for those who work in the cotton mills, and I am one of those who make that demand. Let us give the spinners, the mill owners, an opportunity to dispose of this waste material to advantage. We are going to ask of them and demand of them a better wage scale for the men and women who weave cotton into cloth in the United States. Why not give them this little protection; let the foreigners use their waste material in their own land and let us use ours here.

Would you strike down this new industry? We are told that there are but few engaged in this industry in the United States. Well, let us induce more to engage in it, let us encourage them to use this waste substance to advantage, to turn it into money and enable the cotton mills to pay a better wage to those who are making the cotton into cloth.

As I said a moment ago, there is a protection on the waste material of wool. Why discriminate against cotton? Why not put both articles upon a common level and treat them alike, North and South, and East and West? I am in favor of utilizing both those waste materials in the United States. I would not permit foreigners to send their waste material here and take the home market in the United States away from our people. I would not favor an unreasonable rate, but I favor a rate that is fair.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Under the present law waste material that goes into the making of paper is free. Waste material of wool that goes into the making of clothes and blankets and articles that the people need to protect and shelter them bears a duty of 8 cents, and it is proposed to increase it to 24 cents.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I want to use this waste material for other purposes, and that is what we are seeking to do. I want to stop the palming off upon the people of the United States of this waste stuff in the form of blankets. If a good market can be provided for this material, it will be used and consumed and all the people will be given an opportunity to buy fresh cotton goods and woolen goods from the woolen mills and cotton mills of the United States.

As I understand, a 24-cent duty is proposed on wool rags, and we on this side of the Chamber are quibbling over a 3-cent duty upon cotton rags. I can not understand it. I am utterly unable to understand it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As to the raw products of cotton and wool, if a comparison is in order, we have a 31-cent-per-pound tariff on wool, while cotton is on the free list.

Mr. HEFLIN. And I have an amendment pending to put a duty of 4 cents a pound on cotton coming into the United States; and we have a debenture plan included in the pending bill, which I supported and helped to put into the bill, under which 2 cents a pound would be paid on cotton, or \$10 a bale; and it is but fair and just that the cotton producers should have it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that if cotton rags shall be used instead of the raw product the demand for the raw cotton of the country will thereby be reduced.

Mr. HEFLIN. Not at all. This waste material is something that is now absolutely lost. We are going to have a demand for it. It is used to rub off automobiles; it is used on railroad trains and for various other similar purposes.

My contention is that if a demand shall be created for these rags more people will throw away the old clothes before they are entirely worn out and will buy new cotton clothes and thus increase the demand for American cotton. That is a consideration which is involved in this matter. If the contention of some of my friends shall obtain, all of this material will come in free, and, together with what we have of waste material, will cause a glutted market. I do not want to see that situation arise.

Mr. President, I am for any amount of duty that is reasonable in order to increase the consumption of American cotton. I should like to see every bale of American cotton consumed in the United States and I hope some day to see most of it consumed here. We are now consuming in the United States half of the domestic cotton crop, and we produce a kind of cotton that is produced nowhere else in all the world. I want to get this waste stuff out of the United States; I want to have it manufactured into various things, so that it can not be packed up in bales and counted in the carry-over of the American cotton supply. I am working on that as I go along in connection with this matter.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do.

Mr. BROUSSARD. The Senator from Tennessee has made the point that if we put a tariff on this material it will tend to destroy the market for cotton. The opposite position is that if a tariff be not put on it our market will be open to all the world, which may send this waste product over here, and that will certainly not increase the consumption of cotton in the United States.

Mr. HEFLIN. That is very true; that is the logical conclusion.

Mr. President, I am not going to detain the Senate any longer on this question. I think we ought to be fair to both cotton and wool.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff] can not be entertained in the form in which it is offered, because the same result can be procured by disagreeing to the amendment. Therefore the question is upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky to the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask that the amendment to the amendment may be stated.

Mr. SMITH. Let it be reported.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 160, in line 9, in the amendment of the committee, it is proposed to strike out "3 cents per pound" and insert "if unwashed 1 cent per pound; if washed, sterilized, and trimmed, 2 cents per pound."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs upon agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee. (Putting the question:) By the sound the "ayes" appear to have it.

Mr. McKELLAR. A division, Mr. President.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLEASE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. BRATTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] and vote "yea."

Mr. SACKETT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. COPELAND (when Mr. WAGNER's name was called). My colleague [Mr. WAGNER] is detained from the Senate. If he were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is necessarily detained from the Senate by illness.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I wish to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN];

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON];

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS];

The junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DALE] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON];

The senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]; and

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. PATTERSON] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH].

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—35

Bingham	Glenn	Kendrick	Smoot
Bratton	Goldsborough	Keyes	Steiwer
Broussard	Hale	McCulloch	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	Harris	McNary	Townsend
Connally	Harrison	Moses	Trammell
Deneen	Hastings	Oddie	Vandenberg
Fess	Hebert	Robinson, Ind.	Walcott
George	Heflin	Sheppard	Waterman
Gillett	Kean	Shortridge	

NAYS—27

Allen	Copeland	Hayden	Norbeck
Ashurst	Cutting	Howell	Norris
Barkley	Dill	Johnson	Nye
Blaine	Frazier	Jones	Steck
Borah	Glass	La Follette	Walsh, Mass.
Brookhart	Goff	McKellar	Wheeler
Capper	Hatfield	McMaster	

NOT VOTING—33

Black	Hawes	Reed	Thomas, Okla.
Bleas	King	Robinson, Ark.	Tydings
Brock	Metcalf	Sackett	Wagner
Couzens	Overman	Schall	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Patterson	Shipstead	Warren
Edge	Phipps	Simmons	Watson
Fletcher	Phine	Smith	
Gould	Pittman	Stephens	
Greene	Ransdell	Swanson	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I reserve the right to offer an amendment in the Senate on this subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That may be done without a formal reservation.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, the Senate as in Committee of the Whole now recurs to Schedule 5, on page 121.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, did I understand the Chair to say "unanimous consent"?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understood unanimous consent to have been given to take up the consideration of Schedule 5 at the beginning of the session on yesterday. That was temporarily abrogated by a motion to proceed to the consideration of the cotton schedule, as the Chair understands the parliamentary situation.

Mr. BORAH. When was the unanimous-consent agreement entered into?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was entered into on Saturday, as the present occupant of the chair understands, prior to taking the recess Saturday afternoon.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to ask the Senator from Idaho if he is ready to proceed with Schedule 5 at this time?

Mr. BORAH. I am not.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I move that we proceed to the consideration of—

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, a point of order. If unanimous consent was given, the agreement can not be broken by a majority vote.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HARRISON. I think the Chair is in error as to unanimous consent. A motion was made to proceed to the consideration of the spirits schedule, I believe, and, following that, the sugar schedule.

Mr. DILL. But on Saturday an agreement was made that we should return to sugar. It was a unanimous-consent agreement at that time.

Mr. BORAH. No; there never has been any unanimous-consent agreement to that effect.

Mr. SMOOT. I was compelled to make a motion.

Mr. DILL. If the Senator from Idaho will bear with me, I should like to finish my statement. It was a unanimous-consent agreement at that time. Another unanimous-consent agreement was asked for by the Senator from Utah to abrogate the unanimous-consent agreement that had been made, and that was granted.

Mr. SMOOT. No; that was objected to.

Mr. DILL. No; I did not object. I was the one who was raising the objection. I did not object to taking up the other schedule first.

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; I think the RECORD will show—

Mr. DILL. No motion was made until yesterday. The motion was made yesterday; but when the matter came up here, unanimous consent was given, because I did not object.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I think if the Chair will look at the RECORD he will find that no unanimous consent was given. What happened was that the Senator from Mississippi made a motion that a certain order be entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will consult the Journal rather than the RECORD, if he may.

Mr. BORAH. Do as you like.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal clerk informs the Chair that it was done on motion, as the Senator from Idaho suggests; but may the Chair, in his own capacity as a Senator, propound a parliamentary inquiry and ask what becomes of the orphan sugar schedule under the arrangement which the Senate is at present carrying out?

Mr. NORRIS. That ought to be easy for the Chair, because the Chair has it to answer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair submits the question to the Senate.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, the result of it is that the purpose, as I understand, is to dispose of every other schedule before we go to sugar. That is the plan here. We might just as well be frank about it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On yesterday the Senator from Mississippi called the attention of the Chair to the action taken on Saturday, following which a motion was made yesterday to take up Schedule 10. Under those circumstances the Chair rules that Schedule 10 is now in order; and the Clerk will state the first amendment in that schedule.

The first amendment was, under the heading "Schedule 10.—Flax, hemp, jute, and manufactures of," on page 160, line 19, before the words "per pound," to strike out "1½ cents" and insert "2 cents," so as to read:

PAB. 1001. Flax straw, \$3 per ton; flax, not hackled, 1½ cents per pound; flax, hackled, including "dressed line," 3 cents per pound; flax tow, flax noils, and crin vegetal, twisted or not twisted, 1 cent per pound; hemp and hemp tow, 2 cents per pound.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to have the chairman of the committee give us a word of explanation about this proposed increase. I believe the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. SACKETT] was on this subcommittee. I should like to have some explanation made.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. GEORGE. I will after a moment, Mr. President.

As I understand, if the amendment increasing the rate on hemp and hemp tow from 1½ to 2 cents a pound is agreed to, the second amendment would logically follow.

Mr. SACKETT. Yes; it would logically follow.

Mr. GEORGE. That is my understanding; but I should like to have an explanatory statement with reference to the first amendment.

Mr. SACKETT. Mr. President, the committee had its hearings, and the representative of the American Farm Bureau appeared and made the statement that the acreage devoted to hemp in this country had fallen materially. He gave the figures in 1898 as 25,000 acres, and in 1919 as 7,000 acres, and asked that there be an increased duty on hemp in order that as an agricultural product it might be encouraged and grown in this country.

That is the basis on which the increase was granted by the committee. Hemp is a very necessary thing. It is under intense competition from Manila hemp, and it is under competition in its manufactured product from sisal, which is on the free list; but the representative of the Farm Bureau seemed to think that it could be encouraged.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, does the Senator, in referring to Manila hemp, refer to hemp which comes from the Philippine Islands?

Mr. SACKETT. Yes; as I understand.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course the duty will not be of any effect so far as the importation from the Philippine Islands are concerned.

Mr. SACKETT. No; not at all. But the representative of the Farm Bureau seemed to think that if the present duty on it were increased half a cent it would materially affect the growing of hemp in this country.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the rates of duty on hemp are increased in order further to encourage the production of this article in this country.

The domestic production amounted to about 6,000 tons per year before the war. It increased to over 20,000 tons in 1917, and then declined to an average of less than 1,000 tons in post-war years.

The average quantity of hemp imported each year, and the equivalent ad valorem rates of duty under the tariff acts of 1909, 1913, and 1922, are as follows:

Under the act of 1909 the average annual import in tons was 5,713. The equivalent ad valorem duty was 12.49 per cent.

In 1913 there were imported 6,347 tons under the free provision of the Underwood-Simmons bill.

From 1922 to December 31, 1928, there were 2,506 tons imported, with an average equivalent ad valorem of 8.61 per cent.

That is the history of the matter.

After hearing the testimony the committee decided to increase the duty on hemp and hemp tow from 1½ to 2 cents per pound, and on hackled hemp from 3 to 3½ cents per pound.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, may I inquire what States or localities produce this product?

Mr. SMOOT. Wisconsin, principally, in the United States.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, for the information of the Senator from South Dakota I will state that there are 9 hemp mills in the United States, 7 of which are located within a radius of 30 miles of the city of Juneau, in Dodge County, in my State; 1 is located at Roberts, Wis., near the Minnesota line; and there is 1 other at Wayne, Ill.

Kentucky formerly raised about 40,000 acres of hemp for fiber, which was milled. In Wisconsin we raised from 6,000 to 12,000 acres a year; but the industry has decreased to a point when last year Kentucky raised only 450 acres of fiber hemp, and Wisconsin raised 1,700 acres.

It is very evident that there are other substitutes for the by-products of hemp. In Wisconsin it is primarily a cash crop, and is also used for the purpose of cleaning out fields that are infested with Canadian thistles, crabgrass, and other weeds that can not be destroyed in any other way than by raising a crop that has a very heavy foliage and a very thick growth.

The hemp raisers of this locality, which, of course, constitutes practically the entire hemp production, indicate very clearly their desire for an increase in the tariff. I am not so certain that it is going to be of any special benefit to them. However, I am persuaded beyond any doubt that it will not in any way injure any other industry, and will not add materially to the cost of that which is made out of hemp.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BLAINE. I do.

Mr. BARKLEY. As a matter of information, I wish to inquire of the Senator upon what basis the same rate of duty is placed on the hemp, both hackled and unhackled, and on the hemp tow, which represents at least a partial status of manu-

facture. I see that the present duty on hemp is 1 cent. The Senate committee amendment makes it 2 cents; and the same thing is true of hemp tow.

Nearly 1,400 tons of hemp, unhackled, came in last year, three or four hundred tons of hackled, and 18 tons of hemp tow. I should like to know on just what basis the same rate of tariff is placed on the raw product and on the partially manufactured product.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I have not the information. I have not had the time to go into the matter. Frankly, I can not advise the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Ordinarily there is a differential between the raw and the manufactured or partially manufactured. It may be that the Senator from Utah could give us the information.

Mr. SACKETT. Mr. President, I asked the expert, and he said that hemp tow was just a by-product.

Mr. BARKLEY. Ordinarily the word "tow" has a technical meaning. It is something like a tow sack, a sort of a weave of the fiber. If it does not mean that in this case, probably my inquiries have no application.

Mr. SACKETT. The expert indicates that it is simply a by-product. It has always been under the same rate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Only 18 tons of it came in.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I have an amendment to this paragraph, which I do not care to press now, but I want to know whether I may urge it later. It is an individual amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does it apply to the entire section?

Mr. BROUSSARD. No; it applies to one of the items in this paragraph.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If it applies to the House text, it is not in order at this time. The Senator may offer it later.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I have a further parliamentary inquiry. My colleague [Mr. RANDELL] has an amendment to paragraph 1003, relating to jute. There is no committee amendment in that paragraph. In order that I may notify him so that he may be here, would his amendment be in order now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no committee amendment in that paragraph, so the amendment would be in order later.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I would like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Utah before the vote is taken. Has the domestic production of this grade of hemp increased in recent years, or decreased?

Mr. SMOOT. It has decreased greatly.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is practically negligible?

Mr. SMOOT. It is very small.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And the manufacturing industries which purchase this hemp must have the same imported?

Mr. SMOOT. They are compelled to import what they use.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. On what tariff principle did the able chairman and his assistants on the Finance Committee recommend an increased duty here?

Mr. SACKETT. Because it is an agricultural product, and we are trying to give agriculture a little help.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And all yardsticks of protection were removed.

Mr. SACKETT. The bulk of hemp comes in from the Philippines, so it would not affect them at all, anyway.

Mr. SMOOT. No; Italy is the place from which it comes.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, my information is that 97 per cent of the imports come from Italy, and not from the Philippine Islands.

Answering the question of the Senator from Kentucky with respect to the reason for the differential between 2 and 3½ cents, my information from the tariff experts is that there is a great loss in the hackling of the hemp, and they have estimated it at 1½ cents. That is the processing of the hemp.

Mr. SMOOT. It is true, Mr. President, that there is that difference, and always has been the difference of a cent, but the first amendment increased the rate from 1½ to 2 cents. The ratio as provided by the Finance Committee is correct. The only thing we are to decide is whether we want to increase the rate from 1½ to 2 cents on hemp and hemp tow.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, before we vote I merely desire to say with reference to this item, which the Senator from Kentucky says is a case where we could help the farmer somewhat, that we produce a thousand tons annually. The statistics I have show that the domestic production and the importations have been about the same through a long period of years. We import 1,374 tons.

It does seem to me that since this item was on the free list in tariff bill after tariff bill we could forego this great increase for the benefit of the farmers of the country.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I merely want to call attention to the fact that the raising of hemp is a farming industry and is very valuable to the people who are engaged in it.

I think the Senator from Mississippi is misinformed as to the total production in the United States. Kentucky at one time had 40,000 acres in hemp. My own State had from 6,000 to 12,000 acres a year, depending upon the year. Presently it has 1,700 acres in hemp, which of course produces a much larger tonnage than that to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, the statistics I cited were from the Tariff Commission and are quite up to date, showing that a thousand tons are produced annually and that that has been the production for a number of years.

Mr. BLAINE. The information I have is from the growers themselves, an inventory taken from the growers. Of course, it is a farm product—it is a valuable industry. I do not know that the tariff is going to benefit it to any great extent, because I know that there are certain substitutes which have displaced hemp in commercial use; but, though that may be, it is a farm crop—it is a valuable farm crop—for those who grow it.

It can only be grown on a certain type of soil and there is much of that soil in the United States. It means that plants must be erected where the hemp is grown and operated locally. The hemp is a very bulky material. It piles high, like cornstalks, or corn fodder, and the industry that processes the hemp must be located where the hemp is grown.

It was only the other day that we placed a tariff of \$6 a ton on certain soybean oil cake and meal, to the detriment of the dairy farmers on the Pacific coast and the Atlantic coast, merely for the benefit of one single processor, as I understand, in the State of Illinois, and to the disadvantage of the dairy producer.

I feel about this tariff exactly as I do about many of the farm tariffs. I doubt if it will be of any benefit whatever to the hemp grower, but in the zeal to impose high tariff rates upon farm products, this one product alone should not be picked out as the victim for a low tariff. That is the only proposition I have to make to the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator that he is so enthusiastic, and his argument is filled with so much logic, and he has spoken with such eloquence, that I withdraw my objection.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, to me it is an amazing thing that the chairman of the subcommittee having this matter in hand has confessed that there was no principle involved, that there was nothing at stake, that there was no reason for the amendment except that hemp has the name of being an agricultural product. The industry is practically dead, very little hemp is raised here; it is brought in from abroad to make the warp of carpets, the sails of the ships, hall rugs, aisle runners, upholstery, and belt webbing. It is perfectly absurd to think that because it has the name of an agricultural product the committee should have receded from a principle involved in writing a tariff bill, and proposed to give this article protection, increasing the cost of all these common things simply because hemp has the name of an article supposed to be raised on the farm, but in this case hardly raised at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

PROHIBITION ENFORCEMENT (S. DOC. NO. 38)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD the reply of the Secretary of the Treasury to Senate Resolution 153.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the reply was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[S. Doc. No. 38, 71st Cong., 1st sess.]

FUNDS EXPENDED FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE PROHIBITION ACT

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY TRANSMITTING, IN RESPONSE TO SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 153, CERTAIN INFORMATION RELATIVE TO THE EXPENDITURE OF MONEY APPROPRIATED BY THE FIRST AND SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT OF 1929 FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE PROHIBITION ACT

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 19, 1929.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

SIR: In accordance with the provisions of Senate Resolution 153, I am transmitting herewith a memorandum of November 15, 1929, from the Commissioner of Prohibition, furnishing the information called for by the resolution in connection with the additional amount for the en-

forcement of the prohibition act appropriated by the first deficiency appropriation act approved March 4, 1929.

I have also had prepared and am inclosing to you a memorandum of November 15, 1929, from the Commissioner of Customs, with attached statements showing the use made of the appropriation of \$707,860 contained in the second deficiency appropriation act approved March 4, 1929. The purpose of this appropriation was the prevention of smuggling, including intoxicating beverages. This latter statement is not called for by the resolution, but is being forwarded for the information of the Senate in that connection.

Respectfully,

A. W. MELLON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF CUSTOMS,
Washington, November 15, 1929.

MEMORANDUM FOR UNDERSECRETARY MILLS FROM THE COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS

In accordance with your request, there is submitted herewith statistical data pertaining to the Customs Service in connection with the resolution introduced in the Senate by Senator HARRIS. The resolution asks only for information in connection with the deficiency appropriation for the enforcement of the national prohibition act, and does not call for any data as far as the Customs Service is concerned.

The sum of \$707,860 appropriated for the Customs Service in the second deficiency appropriation act has been allocated to 13 of the land border districts and to the customs agency service. The attached statement shows the districts to which the funds have been allocated, the number of additional employees assigned in each district, and the total sum allocated.

There are also attached statements showing seizures for violations of the customs laws in the customs districts in question for the various periods mentioned in the Harris resolution.

There is also attached a statement based on Canadian customs records showing the amount of alcoholic beverages cleared from Canadian ports to the United States.

F. X. A. EBLE.

Cases of alcoholic beverages cleared for the United States from Canadian customhouses opposite the Detroit area

	1928	1929		1928	1929
	Cases	Cases		Cases	Cases
May.....	125,359	68,991	August.....	146,746	54,520
June.....	147,209	48,536	September.....	154,439	48,625
July.....	166,533	53,892	October.....	162,773	43,400

Exports of alcoholic beverages from all Canada to the United States

	1928	1929		1928	1929
	Gallons	Gallons		Gallons	Gallons
May.....	457,365	282,239	August.....	551,749	322,765
June.....	473,361	253,203	September.....	519,869	252,978
July.....	504,945	239,205			

Statement of the additional amount appropriated by the second deficiency appropriation act approved March 4, 1929, for the enforcement of the national prohibition act

Administrative district	Headquarters ports	Number of additional employees assigned	Total sums allocated
No. 2, Vermont.....	St. Albans, Vt.....	15	\$44,700
No. 7, St. Lawrence.....	Ogdensburg, N. Y.....	18	52,050
No. 9, Buffalo.....	Buffalo, N. Y.....	27	61,950
No. 13, Florida.....	Tampa, Fla.....	9	79,700
No. 23, San Antonio.....	San Antonio, Tex.....	9	21,900
No. 24, El Paso.....	El Paso, Tex.....	10	23,300
No. 26, Arizona.....	Nogales, Ariz.....	10	21,700
No. 27, Los Angeles.....	Los Angeles, Calif.....	15	43,580
No. 30, Washington.....	Seattle, Wash.....	15	40,700
No. 33, Montana and Idaho.....	Great Falls, Mont.....	15	47,900
No. 34, Dakota.....	Pembina, N. Dak.....	10	26,500
No. 36, Duluth and Superior.....	Duluth, Minn.....	4	11,250
No. 38, Michigan.....	Detroit, Mich.....	64	160,730
Customs agency service.....		15	63,000
Balance.....			8,900
Total amount appropriated for the Customs Service.....			707,860

All of the sums are available for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930.

Statement of seizures made under the customs laws for the periods indicated

DISTRICT NO. 2; HEADQUARTERS, PORT ST. ALBANS, VT.

Period	Liquors, wines, beers, alcohol	Auto-motobiles	Boats	Appraised value, all other seizures
	Gallons	Number	Number	
April..... 1928	348	7		\$1,143.43
May.....	2,598	21		602.20
June.....	1,224	21		12.00
July.....	9,371	22	1	1,548.39
August.....	3,781	33	1	352.00
September.....	3,045	27		26.50
October.....	2,283	28		133.45
Total.....	22,650	159	2	3,817.97
April..... 1929	93	3		174.00
May.....	7,786	8	1	3.90
June.....	3,157	17	2	64.74
July.....	3,928	19		180.00
August.....	19,278	33		5.25
September.....	15,408	17		174.93
October.....				
Total.....	49,660	97	3	602.82
September..... 1928	3,045	27		26.50
October.....	2,283	28		133.45
November.....	3,303	21		34.16
December.....	1,396	15		56.67
January..... 1929	2,498	6		920.85
February.....	7,319	9		3,383.97
March.....	3,599	7		18.87
Total.....	23,443	113		4,574.47

DISTRICT NO. 7; HEADQUARTERS, PORT OGDENSBURG, N. Y.

April..... 1928	2,776	20		\$327.00
May.....	1,810	25	1	555.20
June.....	6,654	50	6	534.25
July.....	6,683	84	6	711.89
August.....	5,967	82	5	740.70
September.....	5,122	49	2	1,285.00
October.....	2,788	50	2	1,569.85
Total.....	31,800	360	22	5,723.89
April..... 1929	3,224	24	6	147.25
May.....	4,393	37	2	62.80
June.....	7,604	44	5	1,126.00
July.....	7,518	59	12	848.85
August.....	7,088	72	6	436.25
September.....	3,884	36	2	201.55
October.....				
Total.....	33,716	272	33	2,812.70
September..... 1928	5,122	49	2	1,285.00
October.....	2,788	50	2	1,569.85
November.....	5,614	38	1	892.00
December.....	7,870	27	8	160.48
January..... 1929	3,100	28	3	37.26
February.....	4,273	15	2	1,051.80
March.....	1,499	18	1	608.92
Total.....	30,266	225	19	5,606.31

DISTRICT NO. 9; HEADQUARTERS, PORT BUFFALO, N. Y.

April..... 1928	3,068	10	3	\$426.00
May.....	18,498	15	5	1,212.25
June.....	12,623	10	6	
July.....	7,799	21	8	532.37
August.....	7,786	19	27	597.00
September.....	3,653	13	12	425.00
October.....	7,299	18	25	692.50
Total.....	60,725	106	86	3,885.12
April..... 1929	1,015	6	5	71.36
May.....	1,423	7	15	48.00
June.....	2,855	8	25	295.28
July.....	2,456	5	15	44.09
August.....	4,761	18	20	44.76
September.....	2,681	18	23	723.41
October.....				
Total.....	15,191	62	103	1,226.90

¹ Report not received.

Statement of seizures made under the customs laws for the periods indicated—Continued

DISTRICT NO. 9; HEADQUARTERS, PORT BUFFALO, N. Y.—continued

Period	Liquors, wines, beers, alcohol	Auto-mobiles	Boats	Appraised value, all other seizures
1928	Gallons	Number	Number	
September	3,653	13	12	\$425.00
October	7,299	18	25	692.50
November	5,028	20	12	230.00
December	13,899	27	19	701.00
1929				
January	2,284	19	5	483.00
February	4,901	7	13	220.00
March	1,115	8	3	324.45
Total	38,179	112	89	3,075.95

DISTRICT NO. 18; HEADQUARTERS, PORT TAMPA, FLA.

1928				
April	33,596	9	43	\$10,224.42
May	9,174	6	17	380.08
June	15,677	7	17	264.99
July	5,243	8	19	194.10
August	1,002	2	14	1,683.87
September	1,523	1	3	40.74
October	3,415	8	10	260.12
Total	69,629	41	123	13,048.32
1929				
April	4,989	11	14	134.33
May	3,624	24	28	131.70
June	3,867	6	19	99.80
July	4,752	11	22	60.57
August	4,185	23	13	33.05
September	1,092	16	10	71.40
October				
Total	22,509	91	106	530.85
1928				
September	1,523	1	3	40.74
October	3,415	8	10	260.12
November	3,451	9	7	140.50
December	13,117	14	24	162.60
1929				
January	8,136	11	18	1,690.00
February	10,027	14	37	680.27
March	6,955	24	22	218.16
Total	46,624	81	121	3,192.39

DISTRICT NO. 23; HEADQUARTERS, PORT SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

1928				
April	948	7		\$1,680.41
May	532	15		565.73
June	1,044	14		9,096.75
July	1,164	10		302.96
August	637	12	1	1,941.59
September	1,056	7		207.84
October	900	8		940.20
Total	6,281	73	1	14,735.48
1929				
April	560	14		550.00
May	502	7		200.00
June	963	10		136.40
July	575	14		386.91
August	2,028	15		637.33
September	554	19	1	1,473.81
October				
Total	5,182	79	1	3,384.45
1928				
September	1,056	7		207.84
October	900	8		940.20
November	357	7	1	333.64
December	3,347	23		43,292.37
1929				
January	698	21		1,344.10
February	820	7		1,812.48
March	728	17		5,272.32
Total	7,906	90	1	53,202.95

DISTRICT NO. 24; HEADQUARTERS, PORT EL PASO, TEX.

1928				
April	518	10		\$519.25
May	790	13		97.00
June	463	7		5,324.00
July	844	10		1,417.25
August	650	13		796.25
September	577	13		341.00
October	820	13		206.00
Total	4,662	79		8,700.75

¹ Report not received.

Statement of seizures made under the customs laws for the periods indicated—Continued

DISTRICT NO. 24; HEADQUARTERS, PORT EL PASO, TEX.—continued

Period	Liquors, wines, beers, alcohol	Auto-mobiles	Boats	Appraised value, all other seizures
1929	Gallons	Number	Number	
April	263	5		\$120.00
May	241	7		1,209.00
June	731	5		4,131.50
July	404	10		232.50
August	530	11		300.50
September	540	10		543.50
October				
Total	2,709	48		6,597.00
1928				
September	577	13		341.00
October	820	13		206.00
November	760	10		9.50
December	929	26		200.00
1929				
January	773	9		21.00
February	810	19		152.00
March	459	6		94.00
Total	5,128	96		1,023.50

DISTRICT NO. 26; HEADQUARTERS, PORT NOGALES, ARIZ.

1928				
April	49	5		\$17.50
May	52	2		93.40
June	21	3		118.00
July	62	3		407.00
August	33	3		92.50
September	18	2		130.50
October	45	1		25.00
Total	280	19		883.90
1929				
April	29	1		991.00
May	26	3		60.00
June	15	3		
July	290	6		21.50
August	44	5		101.00
September	36	3		25.00
October				
Total	440	21		1,198.50
1928				
September	18	2		130.50
October	45	1		25.00
November	35	1		69.50
December	88	3		123.00
1929				
January	45	5		114.00
February	12			2.50
March	27	2		2,020.25
Total	270	14		2,484.75

DISTRICT NO. 27; HEADQUARTERS, PORT LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

1928				
April	180	3		\$4.25
May	638	9	1	299.50
June	77	6		72.64
July	118	15		192.25
August	482	9		160.00
September	550	5	1	10,110.56
October	162	12	1	137.00
Total	2,207	59	3	10,976.20
1929				
April	1,162	4		121.00
May	90	3	1	327.00
June	369	7		279.50
July	34	5		266.40
August	460	3		106.75
September	63	5		43.50
October				
Total	2,178	27	1	1,144.15
1928				
September	550	5	1	10,110.56
October	162	12	1	137.00
November	484	9	1	16.00
December	200	7		1,745.00
1929				
January	425	14		1,013.45
February	218	8		5,788.00
March	909	8		196.35
Total	3,008	63	3	18,809.36

¹ Report not received.

Statement of seizures made under the customs laws for the periods indicated—Continued

DISTRICT NO. 30; HEADQUARTERS, PORT SEATTLE, WASH.

Period	Liquors, wines, beers, alcohol	Auto- mobiles	Boats	Appraised value, all other seizures
1928				
April.....	Gallons 152	Number 8		
May.....	733	5	1	\$250.00
June.....	244	4		101.83
July.....	139	4		506.58
August.....	365	7		4,247.75
September.....	185	5	1	762.50
October.....	271	5		7,036.20
Total.....	2,089	38	2	12,994.86
1929				
April.....	593	2		2,501.33
May.....	92	1		45.25
June.....	430	4		78,185.40
July.....	176	3		1,435.20
August.....	80	5		1,376.15
September.....	327	9		4,965.85
October ¹				
Total.....	1,698	24		88,599.18
1928				
September.....	185	5	1	762.50
October.....	271	5		7,036.20
November.....	532	9		733.50
December.....	212	2		1,004.35
1929				
January.....	111	2	1	59.60
February.....	198	2		18,706.45
March.....	101			5,334.20
Total.....	1,610	25	2	33,577.20

DISTRICT NO. 33; HEADQUARTERS, PORT GREAT FALLS, MONT.

1928				
April.....	557	6		
May.....	646	16		\$250.00
June.....	2,616	10		380.00
July.....	1,043	8		974.00
August.....	594	11		875.00
September.....	738	6		
October.....	259	8		
Total.....	6,453	65		2,479.00
1929				
April.....	9	1		
May.....	1	3		
June.....	599	7		25.00
July.....	584	10		730.00
August.....	1,081	11		1,824.00
September.....	490	5		
October ¹				
Total.....	2,764	37		2,579.00
1928				
September.....	738	6		
October.....	259	8		
November.....	594	9		137.00
December.....	329	7		
1929				
January.....	404	6		640.00
February.....	2,946	1		
March.....	347	1		
Total.....	5,617	38		777.00

DISTRICT NO. 34; HEADQUARTERS, PORT PEMBINA, N. DAK.

1928				
April.....	8	4		\$27.08
May.....	47	3		
June.....	67			
July.....	187	2		
August.....	31			
September.....	29	1		726.10
October.....	24			
Total.....	393	10		753.18
1929				
April.....	5	2		122.24
May.....	19			
June.....	34	1		91.02
July.....	77	3		270.00
August.....	220	6		461.93
September.....	43	2		415.54
October ¹				
Total.....	398	14		1,360.73
1928				
September.....	29			726.10
October.....	24	1		
November.....	33	1		633.80
December.....	30			49.10

¹ Report not received.

Statement of seizures made under the customs laws for the periods indicated—Continued

DISTRICT NO. 34; HEADQUARTERS, PORT PEMBINA, N. DAK.—continued

Period	Liquors, wines, beers, alcohol	Auto- mobiles	Boats	Appraised value, all other seizures
1929				
January.....	Gallons 7	Number	Number	
February.....	8	1		\$15.00
March.....	5	2		33.15
Total.....	136	5		1,457.15

DISTRICT NO. 36; HEADQUARTERS, PORT DULUTH, MINN.

1928				
April.....	10	1	1	
May.....	16			
June.....	13			
July.....	57	1		\$9.00
August.....	130			
September.....	265			25.00
October.....	35			
Total.....	516	2	1	34.00
1929				
April.....	3			
May.....	12	1		
June.....	19			
July.....	23			
August.....	31			43.75
September.....	27			
October ¹				
Total.....	115	1		43.75
1928				
September.....	255			25.00
October.....	35			
November.....	886			
December.....	4			
1929				
January.....	2			
February.....	9			
March.....	6			
Total.....	1,197			25.00

DISTRICT NO. 38; HEADQUARTERS, PORT DETROIT, MICH.

1928				
April.....	20,031	51	18	\$13,273.77
May.....	24,597	50	18	1,227.00
June.....	28,521	85	29	505.58
July.....	21,479	94		547.20
August.....	30,979	54	10	639.45
September.....	20,264	44	1	1,502.14
October.....	55,723	71	10	2,522.55
Total.....	199,594	449	86	20,217.69
1929				
April.....	9,972	32	34	323.00
May.....	12,860	37	35	466.50
June.....	8,895	22	33	252.87
July.....	21,811	17	47	125.13
August.....	8,599	18	60	470.34
September.....	14,518	20	43	1,469.61
October ¹				
Total.....	76,155	146	252	3,107.45
1928				
September.....	20,264	44	1	1,502.14
October.....	55,723	71	10	2,522.55
November.....	18,275	61	2	1,623.78
December.....	10,404	37	3	1,563.04
1929				
January.....	10,186	32	1	2,266.78
February.....	15,742	47	1	563.62
March.....	10,934	47	5	738.28
Total.....	123,338	339	23	10,780.19

¹ Report not received.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF PROHIBITION,
Washington, November 15, 1929.

MEMORANDUM FOR GOVERNOR LOWMAN

I have to refer to Senate Resolution No. 153, directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish information in connection with the additional amount for the enforcement of the national prohibition act, as amended, appropriated by the first deficiency act, approved March 4, 1929, and inclose the following for transmission to the Senate in compliance with this resolution:

Inclosure 1.—Chart showing the total sum allocated from the first deficiency appropriation to each administrative district for enforcement work therein, available for use from March 4, 1929, to June 30, 1930.

This chart also shows the number of additional employees assigned to or employed in enforcement work in each administrative district since March 4, 1929, under such additional appropriation.

Inclosure 2.—A statement of enforcement work performed in each administrative district for each calendar month from April 1, 1929, to November 1, 1929.

Inclosure 3.—Enforcement work performed from April 1, 1928, to November 1, 1928.

Inclosure 4.—Enforcement work performed from October 1, 1928, to March 31, 1929.

Inclosure 5.—A supplementary report showing work performed by special agents from July 1, 1928, to September 30, 1929.

The volume of work from April 1, 1928, to October 31, 1928, was greater than the volume of work for the same period in 1929. The quality of the work during the 1929 period, however, showed marked improvement over the 1928 period, due to the Government's policy of concentrating on investigative work.

J. M. DORAN, Commissioner.

Distribution of the first deficiency appropriation, 1929-30, \$1,719,654

District number and name	Increase to budgets available for expenditure, Mar. 4, 1929, to June 30, 1930	Additional enforcement employees since Mar. 4, 1929	
		Increase	Decrease ¹
1. Boston, Mass.	\$39,756	2	
2. New York, N. Y.	39,756	21	
3. Buffalo, N. Y.	32,852	5	
4. Newark, N. J.	34,520	15	
5. Philadelphia, Pa.	36,304	1	
6. Pittsburgh, Pa.	19,044	3	
7. Baltimore, Md.	41,424	17	
8. Richmond, Va.	41,424	8	
9. Savannah, Ga.	63,920	11	
10. New Orleans, La.	43,208	5	
11. Louisville, Ky.	72,492	17	

¹ Decreases shown caused by transferring agents to new district.

Distribution of the first deficiency appropriation, 1929-30, \$1,719,654—Continued

District number and name	Increase to budgets available for expenditure, Mar. 4, 1929, to June 30, 1930	Additional enforcement employees since Mar. 4, 1929	
		Increase	Decrease
12. Columbus, Ohio	\$20,712	17	
13. Chicago, Ill.	51,780	20	
14. St. Paul, Minn.	39,756	20	
15. Topeka, Kans.	46,660	14	
16. St. Louis, Mo.	32,852	4	
17. Fort Worth, Tex.	31,068	10	
18. Denver, Colo.	27,616	3	
19. Helena, Mont.	45,520		3
20. Seattle, Wash.	34,520	9	
21. San Francisco, Calif.	34,520		9
22. Los Angeles, Calif.	41,424		7
23. Honolulu, Hawaii	32,852	5	
24. San Juan, P. R.	24,164	2	
25. Detroit, Mich.	44,876	12	
26. Albany, N. Y.	27,616	4	
27. Salt Lake City		9	
Subtotal, districts	989,636	234	19
52. Special agents' force	401,900	60	
Subtotal	1,391,536	294	19
Adjustments of salaries in accordance with the estimates	178,154		
Dissemination of information	50,000		
Reserve for emergencies in lieu of reserve from regular appropriation for fiscal years 1929 and 1930	99,964		
Total	1,719,654		

Statement of number of arrests, etc., by prohibition administrators, by districts FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 1, 1929, TO OCTOBER 31, 1929

District	Distilleries seized	Stillis seized	Spirits seized (wine gallons)	Malt liquor seized (wine gallons)	Autos seized	Value of autos seized	Boats or launches seized	Value of boats or launches seized	Persons arrested by Federal prohibition officers	Persons arrested by State officers assisted by Federal officers	Persons arrested by State officers on information furnished by Federal officers	Prosecutions in Federal court recommended
District No. 1:												
April		22	4,162.87	5,985.00	25	\$7,415.00			126	56	4	164
May	1	25	1,557.62	5,472.50	24	10,083.00			124	35	6	147
June	1	12	1,520.00	5,738.50	28	14,735.00			148	31	3	149
July	1	29	3,684.00	12,777.00	24	12,060.00			181	37	2	174
August	2	37	2,846.50	26,893.62	51	23,974.00			221	56	1	212
September	2	22	2,945.31	4,671.25	19	9,035.00			265	19	3	281
October												
Total	7	147	16,716.30	61,537.87	171	77,302.00			1,065	254	19	1,127
District No. 2:												
April	4	22	3,647.00	21,628.00	40	33,150.00			120			120
May	7	8	4,087.00	5,706.00	24	14,750.00			172			172
June	5	3	12,917.00	5,096.00	33	15,250.00			117			117
July	3	3	917.00	5,816.00	10	3,300.00			91			91
August	6		15,163.00	11,251.00	11	3,975.00			62			62
September	3	5	4,096.00	12,700.00	14	7,650.00			193			193
October												
Total	28	41	41,427.00	62,197.00	132	78,075.00			755			755
District No. 3:												
April	2	3	1,692.00	5,462.00	6	2,925.00			190			
May	12	19	1,827.00	77,173.00	8	3,925.00			214			
June	5	8	926.00	73,500.00	12	6,322.00			185			
July	10	15	618.00	52,916.00	13	5,645.00			263			
August	6	12	1,315.00	53,765.00	9	3,750.00			217			
September	8	10	992.00	66,187.00	6	3,650.00			213			
October	6	9	7,897.00	30,287.00	6	3,600.00			234	1		235
Total	49	76	15,267.00	359,290.00	60	29,817.00			1,516	1		235
District No. 4:												
April	1	36	9,641.75	8,928.87	6	4,825.00			76			178
May	1	30	19,121.12	13,527.25	14	15,425.00			108			220
June	4	14	34,064.08	34,182.62	6	5,300.00			65			136
July	3	20	10,112.18	9,549.75	11	18,400.00			81			53
August		20	17,368.50	43,320.50	20	16,900.00			122			58
September		24	15,942.00	20,573.00	5	12,250.00			90			64
October	3	27	12,189.75	10,161.50	10	9,050.00			99			80
Total	12	171	118,439.38	140,243.49	72	82,150.00			641			789
District No. 5:												
April	1	10	998.37	12,771.00	8	7,100.00			118			89
May	3	21	3,317.37	64,570.25	20	18,075.00			69	1		
June	1	20	601.87	2,936.37	6	4,550.00			100			
July	1	22	1,865.62	5,701.62	21	21,150.00			93			66
August	4	28	1,548.50	17,653.00	15	11,750.00			63			96
September	1	7	3,726.87	18,776.12	16	12,175.00			72	14		39
October												
Total	11	108	12,058.60	122,408.36	86	74,800.00			515	15		290

¹ Report not received.

Statement of number of arrests, etc., by prohibition administrators, by districts—Continued
FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 1, 1929, TO OCTOBER 31, 1929—continued

District	Distilleries seized	Stills seized	Spirits seized (wine gallons)	Malt liquor seized (wine gallons)	Autos seized	Value of autos seized	Boats or launches seized	Value of boats or launches seized	Persons arrested by Federal prohibition officers	Persons arrested by State officers assisted by Federal officers	Persons arrested by State officers on information furnished by Federal officers	Prosecutions in Federal court recommended
District No. 6:												
April	42	4	1,888.00	19,521.00	23	\$10,145.00			161	118		191
May	63	10	3,415.00	4,894.00	30	13,250.00			174	139		203
June	66	4	3,823.00	6,108.00	32	11,305.00			267	164		285
July	48	10	2,811.00	15,659.00	34	11,640.00			286	172		314
August	57	3	5,704.00	7,493.00	30	11,855.00			183	215		223
September	59	5	4,921.00	11,586.00	35	14,235.00			252	191		299
October	100	11	6,224.00	11,444.00	46	18,075.00			233	341		289
Total	435	47	28,786.00	76,703.00	230	90,505.00			1,556	1,340		1,804
District No. 7:												
April	95	84	4,257.75	332.12	67	16,390.00			220	103		319
May	94	107	27,826.00	2,238.50	69	18,385.00			217	143		497
June	115	10	10,114.43	8,782.75	84	23,070.00	1	\$1,500.00	328	142		505
July	97	27	10,383.86	9,512.00	106	28,160.00	2	260.00	332	159		539
August	110	28	6,310.50	10,278.43	71	17,245.00			283	106		475
September	78	7	8,036.45	9,702.93	73	16,170.00	2	100.00	225	138		408
October												
Total	589	263	66,928.99	40,846.73	470	119,420.00	5	1,860.00	1,605	791		2,743
District No. 8:												
April	379	86	4,242.00	82.50	34	12,425.00	1	25.00	223	53		337
May	336	55	6,501.50	79.00	34	9,575.00	1	25.00	287	47		382
June	278	36	6,708.00	45.50	39	12,910.00	4	105.00	197	41		301
July	363	37	3,454.50	135.00	49	15,290.00			228	54		350
August	402	27	5,622.50	164.75	56	16,945.00			384	92		571
September	315	29	4,581.00	31.50	60	16,359.00			356	65		442
October	390	21	4,099.00	4.00	46	12,815.00			261	49		473
Total	2,463	291	35,208.50	542.25	318	96,319.00	6	155.00	1,936	401		2,856
District No. 9:												
April	290	241	7,694.00	628.50	70	17,710.00	3	1,600.00	292	61	14	257
May	422	332	8,548.50	558.00	77	19,330.00	4	175.00	385	93		372
June	306	236	9,994.25	616.66	77	20,122.00			382	80	9	373
July	291	123	8,610.50	1,379.50	62	14,690.00	4	1,450.00	343	132	2	346
August	289	102	5,898.58	826.75	50	13,220.00			357	130	5	372
September	200	64	6,317.00	767.50	73	14,035.00			334	102		288
October	238	50	8,914.00	924.37	77	15,081.00			333	114	2	256
Total	2,036	1,148	55,976.83	5,701.28	486	114,158.00	11	3,225.00	2,426	712	32	2,264
District No. 10:												
April	88	11	2,336.18	1,088.25	21	5,515.00	1	500.00	237	1	3	283
May	73	3	1,263.91	645.00	21	6,100.00	1	10.00	177	19		215
June	97	14	4,856.56	1,023.75	32	12,152.50			238	17	1	271
July	88	11	2,449.81	2,475.61	25	9,795.00			267	112		418
August	78	50	2,199.25	2,061.36	20	4,605.00			272	75		398
September	40	18	1,779.94	1,283.37	26	7,490.00			176	49	1	320
October	77	28	2,129.62	827.75	43	11,735.00	1	10.00	301	43		439
Total	541	135	17,015.27	9,405.09	188	57,392.50	3	520.00	1,668	316	5	2,344
District No. 11:												
April	158	60	3,228.75	1,081.00	46	20,925.00	1	1,000.00	627	71		689
May	135	56	2,631.75	1,061.50	43	16,200.00			644	79		650
June	145	90	3,694.37	332.50	38	13,425.00			530	85		621
July	137	38	4,243.25	3,370.75	45	16,305.00			655	99		778
August	190	84	2,920.75	2,552.75	52	22,600.00	1	300.00	719	128		921
September	158	59	5,209.68	1,263.12	35	9,860.00			613	121		782
October	189	68	4,076.75	1,271.12	50	15,350.00	1	300.00	491	109	5	594
Total	1,112	455	26,005.30	10,932.74	309	114,685.00	3	1,600.00	4,279	692	5	5,035
District No. 12:												
April	10	24	1,569.53	10,152.37	29	9,725.00			240	3		154
May	2	23	1,667.00	1,457.38	28	11,750.00			225	25		270
June	13	31	2,673.98	2,971.25	30	13,250.00	1	800.00	224	38		214
July	17	41	4,088.60	6,494.87	38	19,100.00			255	28		267
August	7	44	4,144.00	4,195.87	33	11,115.00			422	34	3	405
September	6	21	2,514.75	3,319.46	28	9,225.00			274	19		265
October	9	46	2,414.03	2,291.79	19	8,250.00			285	6		291
Total	64	230	19,102.79	30,882.99	205	82,395.00	1	800.00	1,905	153	3	1,866
District No. 13:												
April	41	64	5,961.00	4,084.00	30	12,255.00			323	13		514
May	61	80	5,014.00	10,522.00	39	29,755.00			399	21		444
June	49	90	17,336.25	21,692.12	34	18,250.00			534	38		488
July	72	100	3,737.00	16,039.50	40	23,175.00			507	31		522
August	95	133	7,637.50	35,092.75	46	18,685.00			641	63		596
September	129	176	12,511.37	20,476.25	41	19,160.00	1	600,000.00	540	34		623
October												
Total	447	637	52,197.12	107,906.62	230	121,280.00	1	600,000.00	2,944	200		3,187
District No. 14:												
April	29	34	3,731.37	949.63	19	6,125.00			260	59	11	
May	7	17	1,250.35	1,680.26	11	2,810.00			248	54	13	
June	17	17	1,392.30	735.69	18	6,500.00			194	35	4	
July	29	28	3,034.84	1,233.13	16	4,815.00			372	47	15	368
August	15	25	1,501.00	1,795.19	14	6,275.00			330	34	44	330
September	27	39	3,649.84	1,952.14	23	9,335.00			358	38	26	362
October	31	37	2,893.94	1,124.26	38	12,745.00			405	52	22	403
Total	155	197	17,453.64	9,470.30	139	48,605.00			2,167	319	135	1,463

¹ Report not received.

Statement of number of arrests, etc., by prohibition administrators, by districts—Continued
FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 1, 1929, TO OCTOBER 31, 1929—continued

District	Distilleries seized	Stillis seized	Spirits seized (wine gallons)	Malt liquor seized (wine gallons)	Autos seized	Value of autos seized	Boats or launches seized	Value of boats or launches seized	Persons arrested by Federal prohibition officers	Persons arrested by State officers asisted by Federal officers	Persons arrested by State officers on information furnished by Federal officers	Prosecutions in Federal court recommended
District No. 15:												
April	29	35	2,907.12	1,289.00	16	\$5,600.00			205	35	37	224
May	16	40	2,615.30	2,021.50	22	7,700.00			190	75		204
June	22	34	4,363.43	4,519.12	15	6,700.00			255	127		280
July	16	31	1,494.07	1,183.17	6	2,525.00			146	47	48	147
August	15	37	1,956.75	1,445.62	6	1,445.00			209	100		239
September	35	34	2,391.46	982.43	8	2,460.00			165	56		130
October	32	42	2,973.25	225.62	19	10,955.00			149	92		184
Total	165	253	18,701.38	11,541.40	92	37,385.00			1,319	532	85	1,408
District No. 16:												
April	22	28	2,147.05	761.12	21	5,910.00			226	4	64	248
May	28	38	1,411.70	1,770.75	20	6,125.00			233	8		213
June	39	22	1,006.13	1,000.46	23	6,525.00			201	15		167
July	23	24	1,411.01	2,206.43	10	3,600.00			237			250
August	16	24	1,202.43	2,219.43	24	7,825.00			258	21		255
September	18	25	1,575.66	982.43	25	6,165.00			196	10		190
October	16	48	1,121.59	1,294.12	15	5,735.00			201	14		175
Total	139	208	9,875.57	10,234.74	138	41,885.00			1,552	72	64	1,498
District No. 17:												
April	63	5	3,083.37	1,515.75	22	7,350.00			299	29		333
May	52	8	1,586.56	1,693.50	19	5,300.00			264	20	30	253
June	53	1	1,310.75	2,397.50	12	4,090.00			269	33		268
July	59	3	2,647.67	2,124.75	17	6,300.00			236	20	1	246
August	49	11	1,777.57	3,075.00	28	20,900.00			356	63	23	419
September	70	5	12,832.62	2,424.00	16	5,465.00			293	26	12	306
October	81	8	1,562.53	1,153.12	23	7,975.00			188	34		228
Total	427	41	24,801.07	14,383.62	137	57,380.00			1,905	234	66	2,063
District No. 18:												
April	15	10	1,383.25	327.12	19	10,175.00			99	78		121
May		12	645.50	136.50	14	6,820.00			103	26		91
June	21	2	679.75	1,741.00	7	2,775.00			115	92		57
July	11	6	2,928.25	1,371.87	19	6,485.00			171	65		107
August	5	9	614.50	562.25	12	3,925.00			99	58		74
September	10	9	584.00	755.78	15	8,675.00			105	47		63
October												
Total	62	48	6,835.25	4,894.52	86	38,855.00			692	366		513
District No. 19:												
April	4	7	632.37	364.12	4	1,075.00			106	5		116
May	11	18	1,574.99	1,856.00	11	5,800.00			177		2	182
June	12	21	3,086.75	1,256.75	8	6,025.00			177	4		188
July	4	18	1,099.25	4,120.12	17	6,835.00			191	7		203
August	4	12	1,148.00	2,917.75	11	3,425.00			163	15		115
September	10	36	700.50	835.99	11	3,145.00			200	9	9	239
October	5	15	974.33	1,386.62	9	1,600.00			155	3		172
Total	50	127	9,216.19	12,737.35	71	27,905.00			1,169	43	11	1,215
District No. 20:												
April	17	18	2,067.25	197.37	21	4,252.00	1	\$3,100.00	84	54	18	59
May	14	15	530.78	540.00	10	3,309.00	1	3,000.00	118	43	20	68
June	11	15	1,206.80	1,094.12	28	11,277.00			125	72	45	109
July	11	10	1,339.37	573.62	27	13,700.00			111	69	39	111
August	10	11	1,452.54	361.00	32	8,186.00			110	108	30	98
September	19	20	800.97	726.50	35	11,945.00			178	43	20	177
October												
Total	82	89	7,437.71	3,492.61	153	52,669.00	2	6,100.00	726	389	172	622
District No. 21:												
April	8	12	651.13	4,106.13	26	6,225.00			142			146
May	23	27	4,621.01	10,266.50	29	7,575.00			166			185
June	10	15	1,822.88	2,431.99	7	4,300.00			74			60
July	1	1	1,196.76	12,295.50	14	5,845.00			163			167
August	9	11	2,308.49	1,691.62	19	5,190.00			219	3		162
September	5	8	4,914.49	2,646.99	8	2,627.00			217	29		177
October												
Total	56	74	15,514.76	33,528.73	103	32,062.00			1,011	32		927
District No. 22:												
April		15	965.00	140.50	6	3,000.00			25	46		18
May		12	1,169.00	1,075.00	7	4,700.00			45	6		29
June		16	990.50	1,229.00	9	5,900.00			55	68		33
July		6	359.00	2,303.00	3	2,500.00			20	52		15
August		8	3,281.50	2,501.50	2	1,275.00			32	48		13
September		2	1,147.00	516.50	10	5,525.00			35	51		11
October		7	3,354.50	411.00	12	6,665.00			60	48		20
Total		66	11,266.50	8,176.50	49	29,565.00			272	319		139
District No. 23:												
April		6	279.00	283.00	2	250.00			29	13		31
May		2	359.00	42.00	2	225.00			14	1		15
June		2	79.00	90.00	2	850.00			34	10		35
July		3	399.00	102.00	4	500.00			16	12		16
August		3	186.00	53.00	16	8,650.00			67			67
September		2	196.00	77.00	2	450.00			37			26
October												
Total		18	1,498.00	647.00	28	10,925.00			197	36		190

* Report not received.

Statement of number of arrests, etc., by prohibition administrators, by districts—Continued
FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 1, 1929, TO OCTOBER 31, 1929—continued

District	Distilleries seized	Stillis seized	Spirits seized (wine gallons)	Malt liquor seized (wine gallons)	Autos seized	Value of autos seized	Boats or launches seized	Value of boats or launches seized	Persons arrested by Federal prohibition officers	Persons arrested by State officers assisted by Federal officers	Persons arrested by State officers on information furnished by Federal officers	Prosecutions in Federal court recommended
District No. 24:												
April		18	82.75		3	\$1,000.00			3			4
May		30	61.75	4.37	1	500.00			8			23
June		32	101.50		2	450.00			4			5
July		64	90.75		3	930.00			10			19
August		28	10.25									2
September		15	10.75						8			5
October												
Total		187	357.75	4.37	9	2,880.00			33			58
District No. 25:												
April	13	18	4,405.87	85,261.18	36	11,860.00			179			176
May	26	30	5,217.25	81,572.00	55	22,130.00			204			202
June	21	34	5,887.00	68,534.50	38	13,815.00			220	13		233
July	15	21	14,857.45	64,168.65	45	13,585.00			259	2		254
August	18	22	13,019.50	123,690.80	45	12,475.00			287			287
September	18	20	2,957.70	43,594.20	50	16,396.50			266			267
October	22	21	5,909.07	56,028.84	50	13,520.00			187		1	195
Total	133	166	52,253.84	522,820.17	319	103,781.50			1,002	15	1	1,614
District No. 26:												
April	4	11	1,189.00	2,954.00	15	5,550.00			93		24	125
May	5	14	1,537.87	7,531.25	6	1,375.00			143		29	169
June	8	10	8,370.75	14,284.12	8	1,800.00			172		40	191
July	3	5	225.75	6,872.37	23	13,779.00			166		26	173
August	5	11	6,788.37	35,495.75	14	3,050.00			243		17	231
September	4	8	1,200.37	14,055.37	22	9,825.00			158		15	163
October	3	4	1,095.37	12,956.25	15	7,750.00			131		14	166
Total	32	63	20,407.48	94,449.11	103	43,129.00			1,106		165	1,218
District No. 27:												
April	1	17	753.50	755.50	10	3,375.00			62	20	24	69
May	1	24	591.00	1,031.00	11	4,925.00			134	38	15	170
June	6	36	758.75	2,127.75	14	4,000.00			75	42	14	101
July	4	17	286.00	1,074.75	9	4,500.00			59	52	16	80
August	5	25	821.00	1,030.50	9	3,125.00			162	58	3	178
September	4	17	1,089.75	185.50	10	3,180.00			64	44	22	74
October	5	24	740.62	419.87	13	3,475.00			72	23	25	100
Total	26	160	5,040.62	6,624.87	76	26,580.00			628	277	119	772
Grand total	9,121	5,446	705,788.84	1,761,604.71	4,460	1,691,885.00	32	\$614,260.00	37,190	7,509	882	33,995

FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 1, 1923, TO OCTOBER 31, 1923

District No. 1:												
April		14	3,309.37	3,864.25	26	\$11,910.00			110	59	2	75
May	2	37	6,347.40	4,768.00	28	13,316.00			144	64	1	66
June	4	31	4,671.25	4,474.00	26	7,919.00			146	71	7	89
July	3	26	12,014.56	11,120.00	26	11,765.00			121	44	7	94
August	1	17	6,219.49	11,768.62	42	16,250.00			169	78		145
September	1	29	4,946.38	4,677.00	22	7,350.00			105	75		106
October	2	26	5,048.63	8,240.00	39	22,725.00			113	67	4	104
Total	13	180	42,557.08	48,911.87	209	91,235.00			908	458	21	679
District No. 2:												
April	76	5	8,620.00	7,283.00	36	15,600.00			983			983
May	67	10	12,200.00	7,261.00	50	17,735.00			975			975
June	17	4	5,094.00	8,882.00	93	39,895.00			269			269
July	11		3,303.00	13,763.00	37	19,695.00			150			150
August	11		6,160.00	6,986.00	35	14,205.00			129			129
September	9	4	1,793.00	29,632.00	97	47,855.00			115			248
October	50	4	11,591.00	13,454.00	36	33,650.00			255			255
Total	250	27	48,761.00	87,266.00	390	188,685.00			2,876			3,009
District No. 3:												
April	20	32	9,204.00	55,884.00	78	44,975.00			501	80		403
May	11	17	2,770.00	70,630.00	52	30,950.00			673	2		576
June	13	25	1,105.00	43,448.00	43	15,375.00			545			449
July	9	15	1,065.00	94,023.00	46	14,160.00			506			447
August	14	25	3,460.00	71,516.00	51	19,375.00			591			486
September	13	18	1,619.00	44,986.00	26	10,700.00			553			439
October	14	19	1,720.00	104,600.00	41	21,275.00			643			543
Total	94	151	20,943.00	485,087.00	337	156,810.00			4,012	82		3,343
District No. 4:												
April		20	167.62	30,558.00	6	2,575.00			54			64
May		10	1,317.50	53,672.00	4	1,300.00			113			81
June		16	1,739.50	5,414.00	12	5,925.00			117			99
July		24	303.00	18,512.00	17	17,750.00			102			78
August	1	11	342.50	13,169.00	10	8,325.00			101			91
September	1	22	4,220.00	46,691.00	8	4,025.00			74			66
October	1	35	4,727.00	4,241.00	7	3,300.00			60			
Total	3	138	12,817.12	172,257.00	64	43,200.00			621			479

¹ Report not received.

Statement of number of arrests, etc., by prohibition administrators, by districts—Continued
FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 1, 1928, TO OCTOBER 31, 1928—continued

District	Distilleries seized	Stillis seized	Spirits seized (wine gallons)	Malt liquor seized (wine gallons)	Autos seized	Value of autos seized	Boats or launches seized	Value of boats or launches seized	Persons arrested by Federal prohibition officers	Persons arrested by State officers assisted by Federal officers	Persons arrested by State officers on information furnished by Federal officers	Prosecutions in Federal court recommended
District No. 5:												
April	1	44	4,530.50	46,911.00	18	\$10,000.00			122			68
May	1	25	4,782.00	20,497.00	23	14,750.00			146			87
June	1	4	635.50	67,325.00	12	11,675.00			152	3		75
July	2	28	2,221.00	38,750.00	18	18,650.00			125			60
August	6	27	14,012.00	26,736.00	28	8,525.00			100			
September	1	23	2,213.00	26,338.00	19	15,690.00			113			
October	7	29	12,452.00	96,565.25	16	8,450.00			132	8		94
Total	19	180	40,846.00	329,122.25	134	87,650.00			890	11		384
District No. 6:												
April	85	13	5,401.00	16,930.00	38	10,940.00			399	116		399
May	116	19	6,246.00	17,547.00	41	25,470.00			399	133		399
June	90	23	4,298.00	29,752.00	39	14,406.00	3	\$25,000.00	446	130		446
July	99	23	4,556.00	16,184.00	47	18,305.00			567	106		567
August	81	16	4,782.00	15,344.00	44	19,800.00			608	46		608
September	89	15	3,792.00	14,531.00	46	18,715.00			401	63		401
October	53	5	3,062.00	11,426.00	32	23,699.00			330	105		330
Total	613	114	32,138.00	122,014.00	287	131,335.00	3	25,000.00	3,240	699		3,240
District No. 7:												
April	112	56	4,658.50	4,284.50	29	15,500.00			317	46		352
May	137	41	8,312.50	11,020.50	53	24,300.00			283	170		447
June	90	33	5,722.50	7,457.50	55	21,900.00			311	74		380
July	79	27	6,651.50	3,737.50	65	20,610.00			256	108	2	336
August	69	68	5,343.25	6,577.75	58	20,050.00			229	5	61	288
September	51	45	5,301.12	2,908.00	43	16,225.00			215	78		272
October	110	114	11,177.04	1,837.00	60	15,725.00	2	500.00	207	148	1	332
Total	648	384	47,166.41	37,882.75	363	134,310.00	2	500.00	1,818	629	64	2,407
District No. 8:												
April	263	124	5,560.00	7.00	34	14,650.00			233	95		282
May	394	114	5,456.50	161.00	30	9,825.00		25.00	170	98		203
June	288	102	6,549.75	29.00	30	16,855.00	3	1,275.00	181	44		237
July	295	94	3,975.00	64.50	34	12,905.00	5	1,325.00	180	34		299
August	358	56	4,192.50	381.00	29	8,485.00	1	500.00	228	52	140	106
September	295	34	3,499.25	239.00	19	6,150.00	1	25.00	239	52		265
October	347	39	4,614.00	80.00	34	10,325.00			133	102	17	293
Total	2,311	563	33,847.00	961.50	210	79,195.00	9	3,150.00	1,364	477	157	1,685
District No. 9:												
April	182	154	4,574.50	902.50	38	10,535.00			307	18		318
May	233	140	9,201.00	2,950.00	63	11,316.25			480	17		499
June	250	192	6,910.50	5,552.00	36	9,840.00	1	5,000.00	395	9		379
July	208	211	4,916.00	1,799.25	55	13,705.00			486	52	8	422
August	299	243	4,739.50	1,731.75	67	18,030.00	1	1,000.00	440	37		377
September	208	163	6,503.50	1,210.25	66	23,545.00	2	20,025.00	471	11		331
October	290	193	5,546.00	1,857.00	39	8,525.00	1	500.00	361	16	1	357
Total	1,730	1,296	42,391.00	16,002.75	364	95,796.25	5	26,525.00	2,940	160	9	2,683
District No. 10:												
April	56	35	5,594.66	854.61	10	2,925.00	3	275.00	225	61	2	323
May	110	18	1,748.17	999.75	29	5,995.00	2	1,050.00	187	31		296
June	64	20	3,010.20	1,061.25	18	4,800.00			148	49		195
July	75	42	9,759.69	1,181.86	14	1,755.00	2	2,000.00	188	15	3	226
August	74	31	1,443.44	3,517.84	39	7,045.00	5	1,100.00	239	45	10	273
September	74	8	3,022.91	3,508.25	30	10,310.00	6	550.00	347	20	1	419
October	74	6	3,518.20	2,641.86	28	11,315.00			198	17	5	244
Total	527	160	28,097.36	13,765.42	168	44,145.00	18	4,975.00	1,532	238	36	1,976
District No. 11:												
April	163	108	2,347.50	716.00	46	17,535.00	1	50.00	496	139	1	549
May	148	128	8,170.58	2,330.50	40	8,550.00			432	122	4	495
June	138	88	2,403.37	1,205.75	39	13,300.00			506	131	6	622
July	110	82	2,367.50	1,900.50	43	14,375.00			396	254		573
August	136	86	3,427.50	2,194.25	40	14,370.00			629	191	3	665
September	140	65	2,972.12	1,260.25	34	10,605.00			508	83	4	533
October	145	63	3,551.25	2,175.75	44	14,350.00			483	68		533
Total	980	620	25,239.82	11,783.00	286	93,085.00	1	50.00	3,450	988	18	3,990
District No. 12:												
April	7	24	1,801.00	851.00	30	15,550.00			165	57		192
May	9	36	754.00	1,732.00	10	3,215.00			227	40		233
June	3	15	1,112.00	3,615.00	14	2,300.00			221	13		203
July		17	999.00	3,138.00	15	6,875.00			235			227
August	12	37	1,099.00	7,457.00	35	10,850.00			295	24		288
September		21	715.00	4,103.00	18	5,325.00			264	26		255
October	16	46	5,185.60	3,780.00	19	9,330.00			246	72		204
Total	47	196	11,665.60	24,676.00	141	53,445.00			1,653	232		1,602
District No. 13:												
April	31	48	4,699.50	11,182.00	18	7,800.00			287	86		119
May	37	92	3,401.50	68,811.00	22	10,350.00	3	3,200.00	456	98	1	434
June	48	63	10,472.50	24,514.50	21	7,800.00	2	3,300.00	426	99	6	391
July	44	52	6,620.49	35,832.45	16	5,350.00			455	58		430
August	42	66	6,543.15	60,611.75	14	7,885.00			546	75		453
September	33	51	3,107.00	26,641.00	26	15,900.00			345	74		257
October	59	96	11,048.00	8,689.00	12	4,525.00			374	128		287
Total	294	468	45,892.14	236,281.70	129	59,610.00	5	6,500.00	2,889	615	7	2,371

Statement of number of arrests, etc., by prohibition administrators, by districts—Continued
FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 1, 1928, TO OCTOBER 31, 1928—continued

District	Distilleries seized	Still seized	Spirits seized (wine gallons)	Malt liquor seized (wine gallons)	Autos seized	Value of autos seized	Boats or launches seized	Value of boats or launches seized	Persons arrested by Federal prohibition officers	Persons arrested by State officers assisted by Federal officers	Persons arrested by State officers on information furnished by Federal officers	Prosecutions in Federal court recommended
District No. 14:												
April.....	26	28	4,652.82	848.00	18	\$5,940.00			236	84	25	
May.....	13	29	3,040.55	2,423.76	10	3,050.00			243	84	4	209
June.....	19	25	2,236.64	3,219.76	13	5,545.00			209	62	11	
July.....	17	22	2,249.65	1,678.51	16	6,510.00			229	106		
August.....	22	23	3,256.99	3,328.12	19	8,155.00			355	55	54	
September.....	20	15	2,197.37	4,750.01	17	5,210.00			279	32	85	
October.....	13	31	4,392.43	2,145.52	17	10,300.00			272	57	29	
Total.....	130	173	23,026.45	18,393.68	110	45,710.00			1,883	480	208	209
District No. 15:												
April.....	45	21	1,495.00	1,375.87	19	7,280.00			243	30	26	270
May.....	46	15	1,776.56	1,106.00	7	3,000.00			220	52		231
June.....	9	25	777.59	1,792.50	7	2,725.00			191	60		199
July.....	10	28	1,393.80	1,507.74	12	5,445.00			166	54	146	182
August.....	32	22	1,650.18	2,306.24	5	1,300.00			288	39	74	313
September.....	30	19	1,529.24	1,336.25	2	1,025.00			141	59	34	165
October.....	30	13	880.56	224.25					85	36	36	100
Total.....	202	143	9,502.84	9,948.85	52	20,775.00			1,334	330	316	1,460
District No. 16:												
April.....	36	28	1,076.96	2,323.25	9	2,075.00			290			297
May.....	50	45	2,750.13	1,352.95	7	825.00			274	2		292
June.....	24	16	1,251.01	1,054.31	16	4,400.00			292	3		293
July.....	18	18	1,011.06	1,804.37	12	3,775.00			255			269
August.....	19	22	3,849.26	1,221.75	16	5,240.00	1	\$500.00	205	3		209
September.....	28	21	2,270.59	2,577.50	9	2,740.00			419	1	2	439
October.....	91	49	2,801.58	3,411.37	14	4,170.00			302		2	320
Total.....	266	199	15,010.59	13,745.50	83	23,225.00	1	500.00	2,037	9	4	2,119
District No. 17:												
April.....	51	7	1,023.25	1,855.71	6	1,200.00			243	4		251
May.....	42	7	1,177.32	3,250.00	12	3,425.00			374	8		377
June.....	57	2	1,054.65	3,642.80	5	1,800.00			322	6		328
July.....	30		1,027.25	3,378.87	7	2,225.00			347	4		348
August.....	47	1	1,590.25	3,885.87	17	7,475.00			422	7		429
September.....	101	3	2,454.56	4,218.75	6	2,450.00			387	10		399
October.....	34	3	593.18	2,628.12	10	1,900.00			245	24		270
Total.....	362	23	8,920.46	22,860.12	63	20,475.00			2,340	63		2,402
District No. 18:												
April.....		44	1,685.50	139.35	14	4,310.00			80	48		60
May.....	7	13	453.50	349.87	6	1,325.00			108	50		51
June.....	11	11	298.25	532.75	7	2,585.00			99	29		39
July.....	15	5	1,073.75	1,589.75	8	2,900.00			78	59		33
August.....	19	8	1,917.25	479.00	7	1,000.00			93	49		68
September.....	12	1	567.75	263.12	9	2,850.00			90	36		58
October.....	6	12	330.50	657.75	3	450.00			150	51		99
Total.....	70	94	6,326.50	4,011.59	54	16,020.00			698	322		408
District No. 19:												
April.....	24	35	2,573.00	1,578.75	11	2,490.00			208	6		205
May.....	20	30	913.62	3,573.62	10	4,825.00			219	6		224
June.....	20	32	983.12	2,069.25	10	2,270.00			180	6	5	146
July.....	11	8	680.91	3,065.12	7	2,675.00			188	33		193
August.....	8	15	1,978.25	2,640.75	19	5,855.00			297	9	10	282
September.....	9	15	817.25	2,683.25	14	2,974.66			190	6		190
October.....	7	17	1,135.37	1,556.75	5	1,320.00			235	12		246
Total.....	99	152	9,083.52	17,167.49	76	22,409.66			1,517	78	15	1,486
District No. 20:												
April.....	19	21	1,256.62	214.25	23	5,533.45			120	54	62	81
May.....	17	18	1,786.62	1,024.50	20	7,865.35			118	26	78	65
June.....	13	15	1,350.91	581.25	24	5,913.10			205	53	58	183
July.....	23	21	691.25	2,418.24	22	7,153.75			167	68	65	141
August.....	20	23	1,445.87	1,495.50	28	8,742.35	1		137	43	15	107
September.....	13	11	2,215.68	890.50	22	8,734.60	1	450.00	103	51	52	94
October.....	21	22	1,377.50	890.25	18	5,340.50	1	250.00	123	75	31	119
Total.....	126	131	10,324.45	7,454.49	157	52,283.10	3	700.00	973	370	361	790
District No. 21:												
April.....	9	12	3,906.87	1,973.00	9	5,805.00			267	16		244
May.....	13	18	5,434.50	19,035.62	18	8,270.00			312	20		228
June.....	22	30	6,401.87	3,862.25	23	11,010.00			281	26		158
July.....	13	20	1,550.75	5,546.50	16	5,865.00			175	33		157
August.....	8	12	2,389.75	13,251.00	14	4,605.00			217	37		210
September.....	16	22	2,362.37	7,545.25	13	7,050.00			137	6		91
October.....	8	9	2,486.75	15,039.12	13	6,550.00			164			75
Total.....	89	123	46,532.86	66,252.74	106	49,155.00			1,553	138		1,163
District No. 22:												
April.....		17	2,498.00	930.00	24	11,810.00			179	71	7	146
May.....		25	2,728.00	743.00	23	6,350.00			139	87	5	106
June.....		16	1,587.00	710.00	16	8,700.00			137	40	15	102
July.....		38	3,206.00	2,807.00	37	15,800.00			157	154	25	90
August.....		8	1,421.00	1,936.00	18	7,750.00			80	140	7	69
September.....		15	793.00	1,107.00	17	8,175.00			110	58	7	58
October.....		14	1,536.00	438.00	22	6,300.00			44	91	15	51
Total.....		133	15,769.00	8,671.00	157	64,885.00			846	641	81	622

Statement of number of arrests, etc., by prohibition administrators, by districts—Continued
FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 1, 1928, TO OCTOBER 31, 1928—continued

District	Distilleries seized	Stillis seized	Spirits seized (wine gallons)	Malt liquor seized (wine gallons)	Autos seized	Value of autos seized	Boats or launches seized	Value of boats or launches seized	Persons arrested by Federal prohibition officers	Persons arrested by State officers assisted by Federal officers	Persons arrested by State officers on information furnished by Federal officers	Prosecutions in Federal court recommended
District No. 23:												
April		51	1,714.50	142.75	3	\$400.00			67	6	1	68
May	18		818.00	498.00	4	1,450.00			50	1		46
June	20		897.90	311.25	5	587.50			56	3		51
July	18		303.25	219.75	5	3,050.00			59			55
August			438.87	435.37	6	3,100.00			36	10		32
September		14	650.00	743.00	1	600.00			49	7		48
October		8	654.00	634.00	5	3,150.00			54	16		60
Total	56	73	5,476.52	2,984.12	29	12,337.50			371	43	1	360
District No. 24:												
April		489	490.00		2	800.00			16			10
May		108	157.50		2	300.00			5			5
June		477	287.25		1	300.00			5			2
July		77	487.50		3	2,550.00	1	\$500.00	5			5
August		261	305.00						24			
September		48	129.25						6			2
October		208	157.25		4	1,200.00			9			2
Total		1,668	2,014.75		12	5,150.00	1	500.00	70			26
District No. 25:												
April	13	14	1,963.73	15,935.71	25	12,550.00	1	3,500.00	167			167
May	24	29	1,982.81	33,125.02	26	9,600.00			223			223
June	9	15	1,775.76	85,916.09	51	15,950.00	2	5,100.00	209		6	209
July	14	18	3,988.72	73,315.98	40	16,400.00			205		1	202
August	12	10	3,164.77	40,335.22	33	8,545.00			197		17	197
September	8	9	987.24	49,686.94	27	7,370.00			201			204
October	12	14	2,405.30	38,925.82	28	13,965.00			201		2	201
Total	92	109	16,238.35	337,240.78	230	84,380.00	3	8,600.00	1,403		26	1,403
Grand total	9,021	7,498	600,587.82	2,094,441.60	4,211	1,675,306.51	51	77,000.00	43,218	7,066	1,324	40,296
FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER 1, 1928, TO MARCH 31, 1929												
District No. 1:												
October	2	26	5,048.63	8,240.00	39	\$22,725.00			113	67	4	104
November		19	2,174.25	5,273.50	25	9,910.00			109	71	9	84
December	2	13	2,891.25	2,019.75	19	10,150.00			80	57	2	118
January	2	52	9,300.36	3,111.25	23	8,270.00			145	59	2	162
February	1	22	2,193.62	4,917.50	17	6,775.00			104	52		131
March		18	3,567.27	2,838.50	17	5,200.00			126	67	4	141
Total	7	150	25,175.38	26,400.50	140	63,030.00			677	373	21	740
District No. 2:												
October	59	4	11,591.00	13,454.00	36	33,650.00			255			255
November		20	6,075.00	11,631.00	29	6,925.00			312			312
December	2	8	16,823.00	5,897.00	21	7,350.00			207			208
January	20	5	4,313.00	57,333.00	32	14,650.00			447			329
February	11	26	22,170.00	17,086.00	137	56,875.00			353			353
March	7	13	9,080.00	8,287.00	45	25,400.00			208			179
Total	99	76	70,052.00	113,688.00	300	144,850.00			1,782			1,636
District No. 3:												
October	14	19	1,720.00	104,600.00	41	21,275.00			643			543
November	15	26	1,191.00	47,596.00	44	14,500.00			433			508
December	11	24	1,765.00	36,923.00	40	20,500.00			467			344
January	9	15	9,111.00	14,305.00	4	1,300.00			203			162
February	6	10	5,612.00	21,410.00	7	4,025.00			258			230
March	8	12	16,752.00	24,295.00	7	3,500.00			201			
Total	63	106	36,151.00	249,130.00	143	65,100.00			2,205			1,787
District No. 4:												
October	1	35	4,727.00	4,241.00	7	3,300.00			60			
November		17	2,214.00	7,390.00	32	27,050.00	2	\$50,000.00	135			64
December	5	42	6,514.00	2,674.50	11	5,950.00			195			16
January	1	35	12,403.00	73,582.37	10	12,900.00			201			103
February		37	1,767.50	19,834.25	2	1,200.00			146			72
March		25	4,228.12	16,052.50	5	3,730.00			107			112
Total	7	191	31,853.62	123,753.62	67	54,130.00	2	50,000.00	844			337
District No. 5:												
October	7	29	12,452.00	96,565.25	16	8,450.00			132	8		94
November	3	44	3,750.50	16,807.75	24	13,550.00			123			78
December		30	1,911.50	10,352.75	7	4,400.00			124			52
January	1	4	10,698.00	18,548.50	7	2,600.00			132			97
February	1	18	2,664.50	16,220.25	12	6,425.00			87	87		86
March	1	19	6,751.31	18,440.25	10	9,500.00			123	68		101
Total	13	144	38,527.81	176,934.75	76	44,475.00			726	163		503
District No. 6:												
October	53	5	3,062.00	11,426.00	32	23,699.00			330	105		330
November	37	4	2,103.00	5,387.00	37	16,735.00			335	14		335
December	67	5	3,942.00	3,919.00	34	12,115.00			464	10		464
January	65	4	2,976.00	40,081.00	46	23,083.00			378	95		378
February	59	5	4,053.00	7,309.00	33	10,900.00			349	89		349
March	48	6	3,808.00	4,922.00	38	15,555.00			203	147		203
Total	329	29	19,944.00	73,044.00	220	102,087.00			2,059	460		2,059

Statement of number of arrests, etc., by prohibition administrators, by districts—Continued

FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER 1, 1928, TO MARCH 31, 1929—continued

District	Distilleries seized	Stills seized	Spirits seized (wine gallons)	Malt liquor seized (wine gallons)	Autos seized	Value of autos seized	Boats or launches seized	Value of boats or launches seized	Persons arrested by Federal prohibition officers	Persons arrested by State officers as-fisted by Federal officers	Persons arrested by State officers on information furnished by Federal officers	Prosecutions in Federal court recommended
District No. 7:												
October	110	114	11,177.04	1,837.00	60	\$15,725.00	2	\$500.00	207	148	1	332
November	73	69	4,816.50	788.25	44	9,575.00			221	76		284
December	96	103	4,356.12	3,933.00	46	12,845.00			289	131		410
January	112	124	8,171.00	5,854.50	44	11,340.00			320	104		403
February	80	81	5,370.04	3,214.75	42	9,550.00			281	26		298
March	75	77	6,238.62	1,059.75	50	11,690.00			198	66	2	253
Total	546	568	40,129.32	16,087.25	286	70,725.00	2	500.00	1,516	551	3	1,980
District No. 8:												
October	347	39	4,614.00	80.00	34	10,325.00			133	102	17	293
November	307	43	4,231.50	77.00	25	8,575.00	2	20.00	157	33		212
December	344	58	4,715.75	18.50	37	10,601.00			223	45		270
January	352	95	4,516.50	69.00	33	8,175.00			188	34		265
February	313	55	9,757.50		31	7,200.00	1	15.00	208	34		276
March	418	53	7,682.00	1.00	49	19,335.00	1	15.00	265	61		354
Total	2,081	343	35,517.25	245.50	209	64,211.00	4	50.00	1,174	309	17	1,670
District No. 9:												
October	290	193	5,546.00	1,857.00	39	8,825.00	1	500.00	361	16	1	357
November	327	245	6,126.25	2,822.62	34	5,900.00			378	11		365
December	344	238	5,045.62	1,226.12	76	22,520.00	6	10,150.00	373	11		350
January	360	283	6,982.00	746.00	88	19,750.00	2	1,100.00	473	19	2	412
February	319	255	8,096.50	1,852.87	72	19,058.00	5	1,025.00	418	7	1	323
March	276	228	6,972.58	601.00	69	21,028.00	2	5,025.00	296	58		248
Total	1,916	1,442	38,768.95	9,105.61	378	97,081.00	16	17,800.00	2,299	122	4	2,055
District No. 10:												
October	74	6	3,518.20	2,641.86	28	11,315.00			198	17	5	244
November	122	9	1,684.87	817.75	17	10,150.00	2	475.00	184	27	2	210
December	76	25	1,711.92	1,058.87	20	7,340.00			180	41	1	217
January	76	17	1,439.68	401.37	24	6,275.00	1	105.00	243	4	13	262
February	75	12	1,730.11	522.24	15	4,240.00			192	20		265
March	105	14	3,444.81	484.75	29	13,115.00			310	10	1	330
Total	528	83	13,529.59	5,928.84	133	52,435.00	3	580.00	1,307	119	22	1,528
District No. 11:												
October	145	63	3,551.25	2,175.75	44	14,350.00			483	68		553
November	80	49	2,380.25	126.37	32	12,275.00			343	44	3	398
December	188	94	5,605.00	4,108.50	42	13,700.00			655	98		741
January	141	40	3,152.00	727.87	26	6,685.00			410	105		524
February	173	87	4,614.50	848.00	29	12,360.00			569	131		739
March	191	90	3,919.75	2,326.00	45	16,600.00	1	300.00	702	134		817
Total	918	423	23,222.75	10,310.49	218	75,970.00	1	300.00	3,162	580	3	3,772
District No. 12:												
October	16	46	5,185.60	3,780.00	19	9,330.00			246	72		204
November	7	33	2,582.00	4,212.30	15	5,400.00			207	94		154
December	4	31	2,604.00	938.50	12	5,900.00			196	20		177
January		16	1,422.25	853.25	9	3,400.00			122	152		225
February	8	12	1,289.00	769.75	14	7,890.00			176	49		135
March	6	31	1,702.37	2,416.25	24	11,010.00			210	10		175
Total	41	169	14,785.22	12,970.05	93	42,930.00			1,157	397		1,070
District No. 13:												
October	59	96	11,048.00	8,689.00	12	4,525.00			374	128		387
November	39	81	3,917.00	10,012.00	16	10,475.00			266	96		247
December	25	97	10,818.50	10,652.50	22	9,300.00			254	33		302
January	42	70	6,054.50	16,350.00	18	9,300.00			422	50		487
February	63	98	5,120.50	7,606.25	17	7,150.00			335	75		374
March	57	80	5,544.00	5,713.25	24	18,745.00			337	7		430
Total	285	522	42,502.50	59,023.00	109	59,495.00			1,988	389		2,227
District No. 14:												
October	13	31	4,392.43	2,145.52	17	10,300.00			272	57	29	
November	27	33	4,605.36	853.38	16	7,225.00			267	38	21	
December	32	29	2,803.85	831.01	17	9,100.00			276	47	20	204
January	18	20	1,673.86	639.13	11	3,950.00			238	45	22	
February	14	7	1,074.63	902.01	9	2,410.00			166	49		
March	15	14	2,225.85	965.75	9	2,925.00			187	42	8	
Total	119	134	16,775.98	6,336.80	79	35,910.00			1,406	278	100	204
District No. 15:												
October	30	13	880.56	224.25					85	36	36	100
November	28	13	1,125.36	444.50	2	1,000.00			134	24	44	135
December	57	20	4,907.24	666.00	9	2,960.00			138	28	21	154
January	26	22	1,481.68	139.87	8	3,930.00			109	36	5	124
February	21	26	1,659.62	429.75	6	1,340.00			119	54	20	126
March	20	42	1,992.12	1,835.25	14	6,586.00			112	91	26	123
Total	182	136	12,046.58	3,739.62	39	15,816.00			697	209	152	762
District No. 16:												
October	91	49	2,801.58	3,411.37	14	4,170.00			302		2	320
November	34	43	5,959.57	2,309.50	18	7,775.00			273	3		294
December	14	34	1,264.26	1,746.37	14	4,875.00			279	1		291
January	40	40	2,879.76	1,112.50	18	5,675.00			270	1		296
February	69	53	4,612.08	2,214.81	20	7,185.00	2	750.00	267	7	5	311
March	24	35	2,181.01	1,014.11	23	9,600.00			380	5		443
Total	272	254	19,698.26	11,808.66	107	39,280.00	2	750.00	1,771	17	7	1,955

Statement of number of arrests, etc., by prohibition administrators, by districts—Continued

FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER 1, 1928, TO MARCH 31, 1929—continued

District	Distilleries seized	Stillis seized	Spirits seized (wine gallons)	Malt liquor seized (wine gallons)	Autos seized	Value of autos seized	Boats or launches seized	Value of boats or launches seized	Persons arrested by Federal prohibition officers	Persons arrested by State officers assisted by Federal officers	Persons arrested by State officers on information furnished by Federal officers	Prosecutions in Federal court recommended
District No. 17:												
October	34	3	593.18	2,628.12	10	\$1,900.00			245	24		270
November	50	5	1,480.03	1,151.87	19	6,752.00	1	\$100.00	196	3		198
December	67	9	1,793.50	1,164.00	9	3,075.00			273	14		294
January	67	18	1,834.58	1,073.37	6	3,425.00			220	12		240
February	51	7	1,183.28	442.75	10	3,275.00			210	9		225
March	57	8	1,960.78	1,067.50	20	7,550.00			355	8		375
Total	326	50	8,845.35	7,527.61	74	25,977.00	1	100.00	1,499	70		1,602
District No. 18:												
October	6	12	330.50	657.75	3	430.00			150	51		99
November	6	3	224.00	737.50	5	1,475.00			63	16		34
December	3	7	227.24	271.37	10	4,300.00			104	14		58
January	12	9	1,187.25	283.37	8	4,750.00			64	87		79
February	9	8	496.81	359.00	6	2,600.00			94	60		65
March	4	11	1,845.31	392.12	8	8,540.00			131	43		101
Total	40	50	4,311.11	2,701.11	40	18,245.00			606	271		436
District No. 19:												
October	7	17	1,135.37	1,556.75	5	1,320.00			235	12		246
November	14	26	3,333.00	4,127.50	10	4,295.00			130	11	5	113
December	21	24	1,703.25	594.75	5	2,050.00			146	20		118
January	31	26	2,036.50	535.12	18	7,350.00			202	17	14	150
February	15	23	510.00	408.62	4	1,275.00			164	10		131
March	8	22	784.74	1,430.87	4	2,340.00			126	4	6	120
Total	96	138	9,502.86	8,653.61	46	18,630.00			1,003	74	25	878
District No. 20:												
October	21	22	1,377.50	890.25	18	8,340.50	1	250.00	123	75	31	119
November	15	17	675.75	251.75	15	3,216.50			68	54	25	38
December	29	32	4,191.31	357.50	28	6,554.25			175	77	46	175
January	16	18	1,346.74	1,348.12	30	9,696.00			126	63	30	127
February	7	7	610.50	73.62	14	3,944.00			48	53	29	46
March	13	13	572.37	302.87	32	9,986.75			120	83	28	103
Total	101	109	8,774.17	3,224.11	137	41,738.00	1	250.00	660	405	189	608
District No. 21:												
October	8	9	2,486.75	15,039.12	13	6,550.00			164			75
November	11	14	1,134.97	1,561.00	9	5,400.00			180	2		122
December	8	16	4,094.25	24,947.62	9	5,515.00			381			243
January	10	19	5,791.63	4,930.50	6	3,100.00			254			162
February	7	15	1,967.75	13,126.37	23	10,475.00			202			126
March	14	22	1,862.99	6,720.25	24	9,415.00			163			105
Total	58	95	17,338.34	66,324.86	84	40,455.00			1,344	2		833
District No. 22:												
October		14	1,536.00	438.00	22	6,300.00			44	91	15	51
November		21	2,595.00	264.00	22	4,140.00			21	18	110	31
December		18	5,735.00	322.00	26	8,885.00			62	127	6	47
January		14	3,390.00	67.00	16	7,160.00			31	106	19	36
February		15	954.00	211.00	11	4,700.00			38	81	10	45
March		7	631.00	172.00	7	2,650.00			18	41		13
Total		89	12,850.00	1,494.00	104	33,835.00			214	464	160	223
District No. 23:												
October		8	654.00	634.00	5	3,150.00			54	16		60
November		12	801.00	521.00	10	3,275.00			70	6		68
December		14	434.00	403.00	7	2,250.00			48	9		51
January		18	310.00	414.00	8	4,350.00			58	10		62
February		15	363.00	83.00	7	2,960.00			52	7		58
March		15	398.00	219.00	11	4,050.00			41	8		42
Total		82	2,960.00	2,274.00	48	20,035.00			323	56		341
District No. 24:												
October		208	157.25		4	1,200.00			9			2
November		51	169.75						13			2
December		6	214.00									
January		69	455.25		1	850.00						
February		49	25.62						1			17
March		21	16.62		1	75.00			10			1
Total		404	1,038.49		6	2,125.00			33			22
District No. 25:												
October		12	2,405.30	38,925.82	28	13,965.00			201		2	201
November		10	4,922.70	53,933.94	27	10,450.00			195		5	195
December		7	2,001.58	38,761.46	24	8,830.00			182	2	2	181
January		13	1,999.62	12,564.94	29	11,841.00			193	1		193
February		10	2,775.43	23,456.66	43	18,459.00			196			196
March		13	3,179.55	47,974.92	46	16,380.00			187			186
Total		65	17,284.18	215,617.74	197	79,925.00			1,154	3	9	1,152

Statement of number of arrests, etc., by prohibition administrators, by districts—Continued

FOR THE PERIOD OCTOBER 1, 1928, TO MARCH 31, 1929—continued

District	Distil- leries seized	Stills seized	Spirits seized (wine gallons)	Malt liquor seized (wine gallons)	Autos seized	Value of autos seized	Boats or launches seized	Value of boats or launches seized	Persons arrested by Fed- eral pro- hibition officers	Persons arrested by State officers as- sisted by Federal officers	Persons arrested by State officers on informa- tion fur- nished by Federal officers	Prosecu- tions in Federal court recom- mended
District No. 26:												
October ¹												
November ¹												
December ¹												
January	7	12	932.00	15,042.00	13	\$5,475.00			322	4		318
February	7	16	2,266.00	8,213.00	12	4,325.00			280			269
March	6	7	3,553.00	7,713.00	12	4,625.00			226			211
Total	20	35	6,751.00	30,968.00	37	14,425.00			828	4		798
District No. 27:												
October ¹												
November ¹												
December ¹												
January												
February												
March	11	47	1,202.80	78.00	7	2,250.00			56	43	18	58
Total	11	47	1,202.80	78.00	7	2,250.00			56	43	18	58
Grand total	8,131	5,949	569,538.51	1,237,967.73	3,377	1,325,165.00	32	\$70,330.00	32,490	5,419	730	31,271

¹ Included in second and third districts.² Included in nineteenth, twenty-first, and twenty-second districts.

Report of work performed by special agents from July 1, 1928, to September 30, 1929

Divisions	Seizures									Cases closed			Cases pending			Persons arrested		
	Illicit distilleries	Stills	Gallons of spirits	Gallons of malt liquor	Automobiles	Value of automobiles	Launches	Value of launches	Railroad cars	Jack-eted	Un-jack-eted	Total	Jack-eted	Un-jack-eted	Total	By special agents	By information furnished by special agents	Number of prosecutions in Federal courts recommended
Albany, N. Y.																		
July, 1928 ¹										2	1	3	30	8	38		69	0
July, 1929										1	2	3	32	6	38	4	15	11
August, 1929			12.00	200.00	1	\$300.00				1	2	3	32	6	38	4	15	11
September, 1929			3,247.00	217.00	1	1,000.00				2	3	5	30	9	39	3	4	5
Total			3,259.00	417.00	2	1,300.00				5	6	11	92	23	115	7	88	22
Chicago, Ill.																		
July, 1928	4	6	1,650.00	4,370.00	2	1,000.00				11		11	40	13	53	9	7	16
August, 1928	13	19	1,592.00	980.00	2	1,000.00				12		12	42	22	64	51		51
September, 1928	5	3	125.00	4,620.00						2		2	40	26	66	3		21
October, 1928				52,000.00	1	250.00				6		6	45	25	70	3		3
November, 1928	1	1	90.00	30,000.00						12		12	37	20	57	2	3	4
December, 1928	1	1	100.00	12,000.00	5	1,800.00							37	24	61	5		5
January, 1929	4	4	350.00	3,810.00	1	500.00				8		8	45	6	51	23	1	24
February, 1929	2	2	1,759.00		2	500.00				6		6	39	5	44	12		12
March, 1929										11		11	25	12	37	14		14
April, 1929	2	2	1,015.00		2	1,000.00				6		6	19	14	33	4		4
May, 1929			25.00							8		8	19	14	33	4	2	4
June, 1929	3	4	65.00		1	300.00				4	3	7	37	16	53	5		5
July, 1929	2	2	6,950.00								1	1	37	18	55	6	3	16
August, 1929			20.00							3		3	36	12	48	5		16
September, 1929			3.00	100.00						2	4	6	35	16	51	1		1
Total	37	44	13,744.00	107,880.00	16	8,950.00				91	8	99	533	243	776	147	16	180
Detroit, Mich.																		
July, 1928			27.00	570.00	1	100.00	1	\$600.00					30	30	60	3		24
August, 1928			405.00	620.00	2	400.00	2	1,100.00					33	35	68	12	6	12
September, 1928										1		1	33	35	68			40
October, 1928			63.00	73.00	1	800.00				1		1	33	35	68	3		
November, 1928	1	1	135.00	1,250.00	6	1,300.00				5	1	6	31	34	65	6		
December, 1928	1	1	171.00	150.00									34	34	68	16		16
January, 1929			2,084.00	843.00	3	2,325.00				2		2	47	34	81	10		10
February, 1929			9.00		1	800.00				5		5	42	34	76	2		2
March, 1929			961.00	831.00					1	2	1	3	40	33	73	4	60	4
April, 1929			16.00		3	1,500.00				4		4	41	34	75	8		15
May, 1929			323.00	228.00	1	500.00				1	4	5	41		41	25		7
June, 1929	1	1	1,600.00	5,000.00	3	1,500.00				1	8	9	43		43	32		23
July, 1929	2	2	4,365.00	3,600.00	5	2,500.00				11		11	42	20	62	31	3	35
August, 1929	1	1	500.00	1,980.00	2	1,000.00				1		1	53	20	73	18		21
September, 1929	2	2	459.00	2,157.00	9	4,500.00	2	10,000.00		2		2	60	20	80	67		178
Total	8	8	12,018.00	17,302.00	37	17,225.00	16	11,700.00	3	46	2	48	603	398	1,001	237	69	387
Denver, Colo.																		
August, 1929 ¹										2		2	3	5	8			
September, 1929				328.50							1	1	3	4	7			
Total				328.50						2	1	3	6	9	15			

¹ District not formed until July 18, 1929.² Unknown.

Report of work performed by special agents from July 1, 1928, to September 30, 1929—Continued

Divisions	Seizures									Cases closed			Cases pending			Persons arrested		
	Illicit distilleries	Still	Gallons of spirits	Gallons of malt liquor	Auto-mob	Value of automobiles	Launches	Value of launches	Rail-road cars	Jack-eted	Un-Jack-eted	Total	Jack-eted	Un-Jack-eted	Total	By special agents	By information furnished by special agents	Number of prosecutions in Federal courts recommended
Jacksonville, Fla.																		
July, 1928.										8	1	9	27	10	37	1		17
August, 1928.			24.50							6	1	7	27	13	40	1	1	22
September, 1928.										7	8	15	22	14	36			32
October, 1928.										6	4	10	22	12	34			42
November, 1928.										7	8	15	23	12	35			62
December, 1928.			44.50	6.00						3	5	8	21	15	36	3		30
January, 1929.			51.50		2	\$750.00				2	7	9	25	16	41	6		18
February, 1929.			318.25		6	2,650.00				6	2	8	23	20	43			19
March, 1929.			405.00							7	7	14	21	14	35			26
April, 1929.			3,196.00				3	\$4,000.00		4	6	10	23	19	42	2		21
May, 1929.										5	7	12	29	21	50			6
June, 1929.			8.50							5	9	14	30	20	50			8
July, 1929.			1,950.00				1	5,000.00		3	4	7	32	16	48			9
August, 1929.										3	3	6	32	26	58		33	
September, 1929.										2	9	11	30	22	52			42
Total.			5,998.25	6.00	8	3,400.00	4	9,000.00		74	81	155	387	250	637	13	34	354
Kansas City, Mo.																		
July, 1928.										1		1	22	10	32	3		10
August, 1928.	3	8	1,150.00		4	150.00				6	4	10	12	5	17	6	12	11
September, 1928.										2		2	12	6	18			
October, 1928.	10	15	421.00							2	1	3	13	9	22		5	32
November, 1928.			2,561.00		1	800.00				1		1	15	6	21	2	3	40
December, 1928.	1	2	64.00	812.00						1	1	2	19	5	24	7		14
January, 1929.										3		3	19	11	30	3		
February, 1929.											3	3	23	8	31	2	1	34
March, 1929.					4	3,000.00				2	1	3	29	6	35		69	9
April, 1929.										2	1	3	31	6	37	4	8	8
May, 1929.										1		1	33	8	41	8	15	38
June, 1929.			500.00							4		4	33	5	38	14		17
July, 1929.		1	2,589.00		3	2,400.00				1		1	35	8	43	20		11
August, 1929.		2	135.50	4,850.00	2	1,350.00				8	1	9	26	12	38	34	2	44
September, 1929.										1	4	5	24	17	41	13		14
Total.	14	28	7,420.50	5,662.00	14	7,700.00				35	16	51	346	122	468	116	115	282
Los Angeles, Calif.																		
July, 1928.										3		3	4	8	12	3		3
August, 1928.			60.00								6	6	7	7	14	3		3
September, 1928.			111.25		1	2,000.00				3		3	6	8	14	3		25
October, 1928.			1,390.00		6	2,350.00					4	4	12	7	19	14		6
November, 1928.			604.75		8	3,475.00				4		4	10	13	23	15		4
December, 1928.			1,063.00		5	1,600.00	1	25,000.00		1		1	10	13	23	17	10	
January, 1929.	1		420.00		2	25.00				1		1	13	13	26	2	8	15
February, 1929.			290.00		1	800.00				2		2	12	13	25	5	2	4
March, 1929.			726.00				2	35,000.00		5	1	6	9	12	21	1		13
April, 1929.		1	115.00	125.00			4	85,000.00		1		1	9	13	22		9	
May, 1929.	1		200.00							1		1	9	16	25		5	
June, 1929.	2		295.00		2	900.00							11	14	25	10		
July, 1929.		1	235.00							3		3	12	14	26	5	4	19
August, 1929.			4,970.00	750.00	2	1,250.00				5	2	7	9	14	23	6	14	
September, 1929.		1	2,607.00										10	15	25	18	7	
Total.	4	3	13,087.00	875.00	27	12,400.00	7	145,000.00		29	13	42	143	180	323	102	64	92
New York, N. Y.																		
July, 1928.	1	1	2,824.00	3,268.00	3	3,500.00			1	3	(¹)	3	57	7	64	8	1	9
August, 1928.		2	145.00	2,720.00	2	1,750.00				(¹)	(¹)	1	(¹)	(¹)	71	16		16
September, 1928.			226.00			1,200.00				2	6	8	71	32	103	5		2
October, 1928.		2	949.00		2	1,800.00				15	31	46	66	25	91	8	1	28
November, 1928.			1,115.00		13	15,000.00				27	16	43	62	27	89	22		22
December, 1928.			687.00	202.00	1	5,000.00				11	25	36	58	24	82	11		10
January, 1929.		38	67.50		1	300.00				28	18	46	39	28	67	5		5
February, 1929.			1,444.00							6	14	20	41	20	61	21		21
March, 1929.			901.00							4	8	12	40	25	65			16
April, 1929.			287.00		3	1,500.00				5	8	13	44	25	69	8		8
May, 1929.			115.00	1,099.00	1	800.00				7	6	13	42	27	69	10		10
June, 1929.			2,432.00						1	2	18	20	41	26	67	41		41
July, 1929.			.37							10	21	31	33	27	60	3		3
August, 1929.	1		2,454.00		1	2,000.00	1	15.00		2	15	17	37	27	64	8		8
September, 1929.																		
Total.	2	43	13,646.87	7,289.00	29	32,850.00	1	15.00	2	122	186	309	631	329	1,022	166	2	999
San Francisco, Calif.																		
July, 1928.										2	2	4	8	5	13		1	19
August, 1928.										4	10	14	5	8	13			21
September, 1928.										5	8	13	4	4	8	1	12	19
October, 1928.		1	200.00		1	3,500.00				1	3	4	3	8	11		10	
November, 1928.	3	5			1	35.00				1	5	6	1	12	13		17	
December, 1928.	1	1	611.00	47,500.00	1	500.00					1	1	2	2	4	4		4
January, 1929.										1		1	2	8	10		35	4
February, 1929.										2		2	3	7	10		8	16
March, 1929.										2	1	3	2	4	6		28	8
April, 1929.										1		1	4	3	7		1	13

Unknown.

No record.

Report not in.

Report of work performed by special agents from July 1, 1928, to September 30, 1929—Continued

Divisions	Seizures									Cases closed			Cases pending			Persons arrested		
	Illicit distilleries	Still	Gallons of spirits	Gallons of malt liquor	Auto-mobles	Value of automobiles	Launches	Value of launches	Rail-road cars	Jack-eted	Un-jack-eted	Total	Jack-eted	Un-jack-eted	Total	By special agents	By information furnished by special agents	Number of prosecutions in Federal courts recommended
San Francisco, Calif.—Con.																		
May, 1929	1	1	164.00	66.00						4	3	7	1	3	4	32		
June, 1929													4	4	8			
July, 1929										20	1	21	2	4	6			
August, 1929					3	(5)				1	3	4	2	3	5	3	23	
September, 1929										3	4	7	2	4	6	2	1	
Total	5	8	975.00	47,566.00	6	\$4,035.00				46	42	88	45	79	124	42	136	104
Seattle, Wash.																		
July, 1928			28.00	196.00	4	1,600.00				2	1	3	14		14	8	11	30
August, 1928			41.00	50.00						3	2	5	12	1	13	1	5	19
September, 1928			800.00							1	1	2	12	1	13	2	8	13
October, 1928										2	3	5	11	1	12	5	4	16
November, 1928											1	1	12	2	14		23	
December, 1928	1	1	410.00		1	400.00				1	2	3	10	6	16	5	2	4
January, 1929											7	8	13	3	16	9		18
February, 1929										3		3	10	5	15			11
March, 1929	1	3	250.00							2	4	6	8	2	10	3	1	58
April, 1929										1		1	8	4	12			13
May, 1929										1	7	8	9	6	15	1	5	1
June, 1929					1	875.00				3	5	8	9	7	16		2	6
July, 1929			20.00		2	3,500.00				5	5	10	3	13	16	3	1	45
August, 1929			61.00	15.00	3	1,200.00				2	4	6	4	7	11	4	1	63
September, 1929			251.00		2	675.00					6	6	4	8	12	7		8
Total	2	4	1,861.00	261.00	13	8,250.00				27	48	75	139	66	205	48	63	305
Washington, D. C.																		
July, 1928										4		4	13	15	18			17
August, 1928													15	6	21			
September, 1928										1		1	14	6	20			17
October, 1928										1		1	13		13	5		21
November, 1928					1	800.00				1		1	6		6	3	2	5
December, 1928													4	2	6	1		5
January, 1929			83.00	43.50	2	1,350.00				2		2	5	1	6	6		6
February, 1929													6	1	7			
March, 1929													10	1	11	2		
April, 1929										1		1	18	3	21			
May, 1929			1,281.50		1	250.00			1				18	5	23	2		
June, 1929													16	6	22			8
July, 1929		2	248.00	39.75									18	12	30	22		
August, 1929			13.25		1	150.00				9	3	12	30	5	35	13		13
September, 1929					1	250.00							29	3	32	21		
Total		2	1,625.75	83.25	6	2,800.00			1	19	3	22	215	66	271	75	2	92
Providence, R. I. ¹																		
December, 1928		1	530.00	12.00	1	1,000.00							13	2	15	1		
January, 1929		3	1,683.00	20.00						4		4	19	3	22	4		
February, 1929			750.00		1	2,000.00							22	4	26	29		
March, 1929			13.00		1	1,500.00				2		2	24	4	28			
April, 1929													31	4	35			
May, 1929			70.00		1	150.00			1	4		4	37	4	41	6		
June, 1929					1	300.00				1		1	28	12	40	7	12	220
Total		4	3,046.00	227,032.00	6	4,950.00			1	11		11	174	33	207	47	12	220

¹Unknown.²This district was formed Nov. 19, 1928, and was absorbed by the Albany district July 18, 1929.

BOULDER DAM

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, the Colorado River Basin States should be fully informed regarding the position of Nevada on the question of power allocation under the Boulder Canyon Dam act. To this end I submit for publication in the Record the official announcements of the Secretary of the Interior relating to power allocations under said act, the official offer of the State of Nevada for the power, and correspondence with the Secretary of the Interior in connection therewith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., October 11, 1929.
(Memorandum for the Secretary)

Attached tabulated statement shows applications for Boulder Canyon power received in response to notice requiring submission of such applications on or before October 1. While some of the applications are indefinite as to exact amount, they aggregate far more than the total amount of power available.

In attempting to make a satisfactory allocation of power among the large number of applicants, or to formulate a contract with all these

applicants for the installation and operation of machinery, the department is confronted with the fact that the States have six months in which to determine whether or not they wish to become purchasers of power, and may require a considerably longer period in which to secure needed legislation to contract for power. It would seem to be desirable that the agent or agents contracting with the Government should be limited in number and that the contract should be of such a character that the applicants for small quantities of power, or the applicants who do not know now the amount of power required, should do this under arrangements with the operators of the power plant, in accordance with allocations and conditions fixed by the Secretary. Such an arrangement will avoid delay and secure action which will make possible appropriations by the present Congress.

Two of the applicants—the metropolitan water district, in conjunction with the city of Los Angeles, and the Southern California Edison Co.—have indicated their willingness to execute contracts to purchase all power available. The Metropolitan Water District and municipalities under the act are given a preference right of purchase, which must be given consideration.

The metropolitan water district requires for pumping water for domestic purposes power equivalent to more than one-half of the total output. Revenues sufficient to return the cost of the dam and power plant exclusive of the \$25,000,000 allocated to flood control, the return of which the act provides may be deferred until after the end of

the amortization period, can be secured by contracts for 65 per cent of the power, thus leaving for future allocation and disposition 35 per cent. This seems to be a desirable arrangement.

It appears that Nevada and possibly the other States enjoying preference right can not make valid contracts without amendment of their constitutions and the enactment of special legislation, which may require some two years, or possibly longer.

If an appropriation for construction is made by the next Congress, it will require at least five years before a beginning can be made in the delivery of power. That interval would enable States to secure needed legislation and give a better understanding of the power requirements than is now possible. Allocations of the surplus power can therefore be much better made five years from now than at present.

In order, therefore, to avoid long and injurious delay in construction and the necessity of making allocation at this time of all power available, three alternative plans are suggested:

(1) That contract be executed with the metropolitan district and the city of Los Angeles for the entire power available, with provision in the contract for release of 35 per cent of the power for the use of the States and other applicants, like the Southern California Edison Co., to whom it may be later allocated by the Secretary, such allocation to be made with due regard to preference rights and the public interest, as the act requires.

(2) That contract be executed with the metropolitan water district and the city of Los Angeles for 65 per cent of the power available for use by that district, the city of Los Angeles, and other municipalities in southern California, with provision for later allocation of the remaining 35 per cent to the States and other applicants, such allocation to be made by the Secretary, with due regard to preference rights and the public interest, as the act requires.

(3) That contract be executed with the metropolitan water district, the city of Los Angeles, and the Southern California Edison Co. for the entire power available, the metropolitan water district to be entitled to such amount of power as may be necessary to pump water for domestic purposes, with provision in the contract for release of the remaining available power for use of the States and other applicants to whom it may be allocated by the Secretary, such allocation to be made with due regard to preference rights and the public interest, as the act requires.

This partial allocation would take care of the preference rights of the metropolitan water district and other municipalities of southern California, and would insure sufficient revenue to meet the minimum requirements of the act. Congress could then make the necessary appropriations for the beginning of construction without further delay.

ELWOOD MEAD,

Commissioner of Reclamation.

Annual revenue necessary to meet minimum requirement of act at rate of 1.63 mills per kilowatt

Total annual revenue required to repay cost of Boulder Canyon Dam and power-plant building, including \$25,000,000 allocated to flood control and proportionate payments to Arizona and Nevada, assuming machinery and equipment installed by lessees and power plant operated by lessees.....	\$5,665,000
Annual revenue to provide for repayment of flood control and proportionate payments to Arizona and Nevada.....	1,862,000
Minimum annual revenue required under act before construction can be undertaken.....	3,803,000
Revenue which would be derived from partial allocation of 65 per cent of available energy (2,340,000,000 kilowatt hours), at proposed rate of \$0.00163.....	3,814,000

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT,

Washington, D. C., October 14, 1929.

(Power machinery installed and power plant operated by lessees)

(A) GENERAL REGULATIONS FOR SALE OF POWER AND WATER, BOULDER CANYON PROJECT

1. The United States will construct the dam, including outlet works, power tunnels, and the power-plant building.

2. The lessees of power shall purchase and install the penstocks, machinery, and equipment in the power plant and shall provide the necessary switching, transforming, and transmission facilities.

3. The United States will operate and maintain the dam, reservoir, power tunnels, and outlet works, and will regulate the flow of water. The dam and reservoir will be operated and used for: First, river regulation, improvement of navigation, and flood control; second, for irrigation and domestic uses and satisfaction of present perfected rights in pursuance of Article VIII of the Colorado River compact; and, third, for power.

4. The lessees of power shall operate and maintain the power plant and its accessories.

5. The lessees of power will be required to form an organization satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of purchasing, installing, operating, and maintaining the machinery and equipment in the power plant.

6. Energy will be measured at generator voltage.

7. The rate for sale of energy will be 1.63 mills per kilowatt-hour, with provision for readjustment of the rate at the end of 15 years

from the date of execution of contract and every 10 years thereafter, as provided in section 5 (a) of the Boulder Canyon project act.

8. The contractor shall pay monthly for energy in accordance with the above rate. Payments shall be due on the 15th of the month immediately succeeding the month in which energy is used. If such charges are not paid when due, a penalty of 1 per cent of the amount unpaid shall be added thereto, and thereafter an additional penalty of 1 per cent of the amount unpaid shall be added on the 1st day of each calendar month during such delinquency.

9. Each contractor shall guarantee a minimum annual payment equivalent to the amount of energy contracted for times 1.63 mills per kilowatt-hour. Minimum payments shall be due on June 1 of each year, commencing on June 1 next following the date water is first available for the generation of power. For fractional years, at the beginning or end of the contract period, the minimum annual payment shall be proportionately adjusted in the ratio that the number of days water is available for power bears to 365 days.

10. Each applicant, if so required by the Secretary of the Interior, shall furnish for the use and benefit of the United States a bid bond or certified check in the amount of \$2,500 to insure execution of required contract. Each contractor, if so required by the Secretary of the Interior, shall furnish for the use and benefit of the United States a performance bond in the penal sum equal to the minimum annual payment provided by the contract conditioned on the faithful performance thereof.

11. No charge will be made for water used in Imperial and Coachella Valleys. The rate for sale of water elsewhere shall be as follows:

(a) Fifty cents per acre-foot for water diverted by Metropolitan Water District below power outlets of Boulder Canyon Dam;

(b) Ten cents per acre-foot for water diverted for irrigation purposes below power outlets of Boulder Canyon Dam; and

(c) Fifty cents per acre-foot for water diverted for domestic purposes below water outlets of Boulder Canyon Dam.

A charge in addition to the rates stated in (a), (b), and (c) will be made for water diverted above the power outlets of Boulder Canyon Dam to compensate for reduction in energy output at the dam due to such diversion.

12. All machinery and equipment in Boulder Canyon power plant, and plans for the installation thereof, shall receive advance approval of the Secretary of the Interior, and such machinery and equipment shall be installed in a manner satisfactory to said Secretary.

13. All machinery and apparatus at Boulder Canyon power plant shall be maintained in such condition that each unit can at all times develop not less than 95 per cent of its capacity when first installed and tested for acceptance.

14. In addition to these general regulations the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe and enforce rules and regulations conforming with the requirements of the Federal water power act so far as applicable, respecting maintenance of works in condition of repair adequate for their efficient operation, maintenance of a system of accounting, control of rates and service in the absence of State regulation or interstate agreement, valuation for rate-making purposes, transfers of contracts, contracts extending beyond the lease period, expropriation of excessive profits, recapture and/or emergency use by the United States of property of lessees, and penalties for enforcing regulations made under the Boulder Canyon project act or penalizing failure to comply with such regulations or with the provisions of the Boulder Canyon project act. The Secretary of the Interior shall also conform with other provisions of the Federal water power act and of rules and regulations of the Federal Power Commission, which have been or may be devised, for the protection of the investor and consumer.

15. No contract for electrical energy or for generation of electrical energy shall be of longer duration than 50 years from the date at which such energy is ready for delivery.

16. Contracts respecting water for irrigation and domestic uses shall be for permanent service.

17. The holder of any contract for electrical energy not in default thereunder shall be entitled to a renewal thereof upon such terms and conditions as may be authorized or required under the then existing laws and regulations, unless the property of such holder dependent for its usefulness on a continuation of the contract be purchased or acquired and such holder be compensated for damages to its property, used and useful in the transmission and distribution of such electrical energy and not taken, resulting from the termination of the supply.

18. In case of conflicting applications, if any, such conflicts shall be resolved by the Secretary of the Interior, after hearing, with due regard to the public interest, and in conformity with the policy expressed in the Federal water power act as to conflicting applications for permits and licenses, except that preference to applicants for the use of water and appurtenant works and privileges necessary for the generation and distribution of hydroelectric energy shall be given to a State for the generation of electric energy for use in the States, and the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada shall be given equal opportunity as such applicants. The rights covered by such preference shall be contracted for within six months after notice by the Secretary of the Interior and shall

be paid for on the same terms and conditions as provided in other similar contracts.

19. Any agency receiving a contract for electrical energy equivalent to 100,000 firm horsepower, or more, may, when deemed feasible by the Secretary of the Interior, from engineering and economic considerations and under general regulations prescribed by him, be required to permit any other agency having contracts for less than the equivalent of 25,000 firm horsepower, upon application to the Secretary of the Interior made within 60 days from the execution of the contract of the agency the use of whose transmission line is applied for, to participate in the benefits and use of any main transmission line constructed or to be constructed by the former for carrying such energy (not exceeding, however, one-fourth the capacity of such line), upon payment by such other agencies of a reasonable share of the cost of construction, operation, and maintenance thereof.

20. The use is authorized of such public and reserved lands of the United States as may be necessary or convenient for the construction, operation, and maintenance of main transmission lines to transmit the electrical energy generated.

21. Disputes or disagreements as to the interpretation or performance of contracts relative to the sale or generation of electrical energy shall be determined either by arbitration or court proceedings, the Secretary of the Interior being authorized to act for the United States in such proceedings.

22. The Secretary of the Interior, or his representatives shall at all times have the right of ingress to and egress from all works of the contractors for power or power privileges, for the purpose of inspection, repairs, and maintenance of works of the United States, and for all other proper purposes. The Secretary of the Interior or his representatives shall also have free access at all reasonable times to the books and records of contractors for power or power privileges, relating to the generation, transmission, distribution, or sale of electrical energy with the right at any time during office hours to make copies of or from the same.

23. All patents, grants, contracts, concessions, leases, permits licenses, rights of way, or other privileges from the United States or under its authority, necessary or convenient for the use of waters of the Colorado River or its tributaries, or for the generation or transmission of electrical energy generated by means of the waters of said river or its tributaries, whether under the Boulder Dam project act, the Federal water power act, or otherwise, shall be upon the express condition and with the express covenant that the rights of the recipients or holders thereof to waters of the river or its tributaries, for the use of which the same are necessary, convenient, or incidental, and the use of the same shall likewise be subject to and controlled by said Colorado River compact.

24. The Secretary of the Interior reserves the right to amend these regulations in any manner not inconsistent with the provisions of the Boulder Canyon project act, or acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., October 21, 1929.
(Memorandum for the press)

The Secretary of the Interior announced to-day his decision in regard to the allocation of Boulder Dam power. He appointed November 12 as the date for a formal hearing in case of any protest.

The power to be developed at the Boulder Dam, subject to certain deductions, is to be contracted for as follows:

To the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, 50 per cent, or so much thereof as may be needed and used for the pumping of Colorado River water.

To the city of Los Angeles, 25 per cent; and
To the Southern California Edison and associated companies, 25 per cent.

These allotments are to be subject to certain deductions which may arise through the exercise of preference rights, i. e.,

(a) Not exceeding 18 per cent of the total power developed for the State of Nevada for use in Nevada;

(b) Not exceeding 18 per cent of the total power for the State of Arizona, for use in Arizona, as above; and should either of the States not exercise its preference rights the other may absorb them up to 4 per cent;

(c) Not exceeding 4 per cent for municipalities which have heretofore filed applications.

All such preference rights in whole or in part are to be exercised by the execution of valid contracts with the respective States and municipalities satisfactory to the Secretary, and the exercise of such preference rights is to reduce proportionately the above allotments to the district, the city, and the company.

Any State desiring to withdraw power within the limitations above stated must serve on the Secretary of the Interior written notice within not less than 12 months of the amount of power desired, and for

the purchase of which valid contracts satisfactory to the Secretary must be executed.

Power contracted for but not required within a State shall be allocated to the city and the company on a 50-50 basis, with the reservation that it can again be called for within a reasonable time for use within the State. All power provided a State shall be at actual cost.

Should the 50 per cent allocated to the metropolitan water district be not required for pumping, this shall become available to the city of Los Angeles, 66% per cent; to the Southern California Edison and associated companies 33% per cent.

Any municipalities desiring power within the limitation prescribed must execute the necessary contract therefor within 12 months from the date the contracts are made with the district, and the city.

Any firm power available at the Boulder Canyon Dam for the payment of which other contractors do not become and remain liable, aside from that allocated to the metropolitan district, shall be taken and paid for by the city of Los Angeles and the Edison Co., on a 50-50 basis.

The contract for the available power is to be made with the city of Los Angeles, and the metropolitan water district, with various subcontracts assuring the above, and providing for a board of control made up of 2 members nominated by the city of Los Angeles and the metropolitan water district, 2 by the Southern California Edison and associated companies, and 1 by the Secretary of the Interior, to act with the city of Los Angeles in the operation of the plant.

The Federal Government will install the dam, tunnels, power house, and penstocks. The machinery for the generation and distribution of power is to be provided and installed by the lessee. The costs of installation and operation are to be borne by those contracting for the power in proportion to the amounts received. When the dam and power house are actually in operation the lessees may have the right to ask for a review of the actual cost of units of power and be entitled to deductions which will still permit the charge made to return to the Government all advances and interest in accordance with the Boulder Dam act, and provided further that if such review indicates that a higher rate should be paid for power to meet the obligation to the Federal Government such an advance in rate will be put into effect.

There is a clause inserted in all of the contracts which will insure the distribution of all power developed at the Boulder Dam at such a price as in the opinion of the Federal Power Commission is fair to all consumers. Should certain municipalities operating their own power plants desire to make separate agreements with the city of Los Angeles and the metropolitan water district they shall be supplied with power at cost price.

The charge for storing water for the metropolitan water district will be 25 cents per acre-foot.

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 29, 1929.

HON. RAY LYMAN WILBUR,
Secretary of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have received a telegram from a prominent man in Nevada, whose opinion I respect, to the effect that certain people in the State construe your memorandum on power allocation as requiring Nevada to give notice of all power desired within 12 months of date of power contracts and that Nevada's right to apply for power terminates 12 months after said date. He states that this point seems uncertain in your memorandum and asks if you will kindly clarify this and give us an assurance that Nevada may exercise her right to withdraw power within the life of power contracts upon giving 12 months' notice.

An early reply will be very much appreciated by me.

With my kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

TASKER L. ODDIE.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, November 1, 1929.

HON. TASKER L. ODDIE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR ODDIE: In your letter of October 29 you make inquiry concerning the interpretation to be given the 12 months' notice required by the States of Nevada and Arizona of their desire to withdraw and use Boulder Dam power under the allocation made October 21.

In providing for such notice consideration must be given to the rights of the primary contractors who assume liability for payment of all the power. If the primary contractors are agreeable to the plan now proposed by certain Nevada citizens of permitting withdrawal of power at any time during the life of the primary contract upon 12 months' notice, I should be glad to provide accordingly.

Before any more definite statement can be made concerning the plan now suggested, it seems advisable to ascertain the views of the proposed primary contractors and to consider whether the plan suggested is workable. These matters will be taken up at the hearing set for November 12.

Very truly yours,

RAY LYMAN WILBUR.

NOVEMBER 12, 1929.

HON. RAY LYMAN WILBUR,

Secretary of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The allocations of power announced by you on October 21, 1929, and the general procedure for the disposition of power under the Boulder Canyon Dam act are so obviously designed in the interests of California and at the expense of the interests and sovereign rights of the State of Nevada, that I desire, on behalf of that State, to enter a protest.

The act contains certain fundamental principles and mandatory provisions which limit the Secretary's discretion in making power allocations. Quoting from section 5 (c) of the Boulder Canyon Dam act, "In case of conflicting applications, if any, such conflicts shall be resolved by the said Secretary after hearing, with due regard to the public interest, and in conformity with the policy expressed in the Federal water power act as to conflicting applications for permits and licenses, except that preference to applicants for the use of water and appurtenant works and privileges necessary for the generation and distribution of hydroelectric energy, or for delivery at the switchboard of a hydroelectric plant, shall be given, first, to a State for the generation or purchase of electric energy for use in the State, and the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada shall be given equal opportunity as such applicants."

As the law provides that equal opportunity be given the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, there can be no question but that Congress intended that the primary allocation of power should be tendered one-third of the total to each of the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, and that the sovereignty of these States should be recognized before a municipality or private power interest.

Under the proposal which you have made, the interests of the State of Nevada has been subordinated and made subservient to the interests of southern California.

On October 29, 1929, I requested you to give me an interpretation of the 12-month notice required of the States of Nevada and Arizona, and specified in your allocation of October 21, 1929, stating their desire to withdraw and use Boulder Dam power under the allocation of October 21, 1929. To this you replied on November 1, 1929, as follows:

"In providing for such notice consideration must be given to the rights of the primary contractors who assume liability for payment of all the power. If the primary contractors are agreeable to the plan now proposed by certain Nevada citizens of permitting withdrawal of power at any time during the life of the primary contract upon 12 months' notice, I should be glad to provide accordingly."

"Before any more definite statement can be made concerning the plan now suggested, it seems advisable to ascertain the views of the proposed primary contractors and to consider whether the plan suggested is workable. These matters will be taken up at the hearing set for November 12."

The subservency of Nevada's interests is demonstrated in your reply to my request, which states that it will be necessary for Nevada to obtain permission from the primary contractors of southern California to modify the provisions of recapture. The Boulder Canyon Dam act does not contemplate, and Congress never intended to place Nevada in such a position of humiliation and subservency to municipalities and private power interests in another State.

The State of Nevada, in the formulation of the provisions of the 7-State compact and in the formulation of the Boulder Canyon Dam act, has, as is well known, been exceedingly generous in the allocation of water in reserving to herself only 300,000 acre-feet of water and allowing 7,200,000 acre-feet of water to be divided between Arizona and California, and the provisions of your power allocation, therefore, are received in Nevada with surprise and regret. The physical conditions in Nevada preclude her using at this time more than a comparatively small amount of Colorado River water, but the physical conditions in southern California, on the other hand, make it vitally necessary that she have a large amount of this water for her very life and growth. On the other hand, Nevada will ultimately need a large amount of the power to be developed at the dam. California does not need all of this power because of a surplus amount of power at present developed within the State.

If the allocations of power which you have suggested were put into effect and under the provisions which you have stipulated, it would inevitably lead substantially to a transfer of the ownership of the power to California interests. In time this would mean that the California interests would be able to resell this power to Nevada at a profit and Nevada's development would be dependent upon the repurchase of that power at a greater cost.

In the proposed allocation of power the Government has failed to consider its obligation to administer its trust as custodian of the enormous area of unappropriated public domain in Nevada belonging to the Government, which amounts to over 53,000,000 acres, or about 75 per cent of the area of the State, exclusive of the large areas embraced within the Indian reservations and forest reserves. The great undeveloped mineral and agricultural resources in Nevada on the public domain, which are largely dependent upon Boulder Canyon Dam power for development, are owned by the Federal Government, and should be fully considered and protected in the allocation of this power, which

under your proposal is inadequate. In case of conflicting applications, such as here exist between Nevada and California, section 5 (c) states that such conflicts shall be resolved by the Secretary after public hearings, with due regard to the public interest. This is unquestionable proof that Congress left no room for discretion with the Secretary of the Interior in considering the public interest in the allocation of the power to be developed at Boulder Canyon Dam, and the public interest demands that each of these three sovereign States receive equal shares of the total power to be developed.

Unless Nevada's full quota of one-third of the power is conserved for the use of the development of the natural resources of the State many of these valuable resources will lie dormant indefinitely, which would be a national as well as a State liability and loss. If, on the other hand, the Secretary were to conserve for Nevada her full quota of one-third of the power, which would permit the fullest development of the natural resources on the public domain in that State, it would constitute a national asset and would enable the State of Nevada to reach her highest economic development.

The Secretary of the Interior, adequately to safeguard the national interests, should submit the proposal to sell power developed at Boulder Canyon Dam to national competition and on terms which are agreeable to the States involved. Instead of predicated his decision, as the Secretary has done, largely on the alleged demands of the municipalities and power interests of southern California only, he should have predicated his decision on the broad national interests involved and have given consideration first, after the Federal interests, to the primary interests of the sovereign States involved.

In effect it would seem that under the allocations made by the Secretary of the Interior on October 21, 1929, in which an allocation of 100 per cent of the power to be developed at Boulder Canyon Dam is to be allocated to the State of California, that those interests are receiving the almost exclusive power benefits of the Government's investment of capital at the lowest rates of interest for the construction of the dam and the power plant. As a matter of public policy, this method of procedure is indefensible. Since the Government is advancing the capital, it should consider first its own obligations to develop the natural resources on its public domain tributary to this power development, and Congress, in providing that the power requirements of the States of Nevada, Arizona, and California should first be considered, and on the basis of equality of allocation, so intended.

In limiting Nevada's power quota to 18 per cent of the total power to be developed at Boulder Canyon the reason stated is that it will be many years before Nevada can use her full quota of one-third of the power specified under the act. The metropolitan water district at the present time has no immediate demand for the power. Presumably the Secretary's allocation of one-half of the power to the metropolitan water district is predicated wholly upon the anticipated need of power for pumping water for the district's water supply. It would be many years before the major portion of the 50 per cent allocation of Boulder Canyon Dam power would be consumed in pumping in connection with the water supply.

There does not appear to be as great an immediate need for the power to be developed at Boulder Canyon Dam in the metropolitan water district and in the city of Los Angeles as there is in Nevada, and the future prospects for consumption of power for pumping purposes are even more remote than those of using the power in Nevada for the development of her natural resources and future manufacturing industries. The metropolitan water district is not now in the power business. Furthermore, if there is no immediate demand for Boulder Canyon Dam power in the metropolitan water district and in the city of Los Angeles it would seem that the allocation of 75 per cent of the power to them, suggested by the Secretary, would, in effect, create a politico-power organization largely at the expense of the development of the Federal and State natural resources in Nevada. Any other course would not be consistent with sound public policy.

It is to be hoped that the conference on November 12 will adopt a course of procedure which will make primary allocations of one-third of the power to each of the States of Nevada, Arizona, and California and provide for competitive bidding for the power on terms and under provisions in the formulation of which the States involved will be allowed fully to participate.

If an agreement to make equitable power allocations as indicated and under a method which will fully protect the public interest and the inherent sovereign rights of the State of Nevada can not be adopted, it may become necessary to amend the act.

I sincerely hope that the conference will be able to settle all differences on an equitable basis, so that no delays will occur in commencing the construction of the dam. If it becomes necessary, I will be ready at any time to offer an amendment to the act to fully protect Nevada's interests in the allocation of this power.

Very sincerely yours,

TASKER L. ODDIE.

Mr. ODDIE. The following letter was addressed to the Secretary of the Interior by Dr. Colin G. Fink, head of the department of electrochemistry at Columbia University and secretary of the American Electrochemical Society:

NOVEMBER 13, 1929.

HON. RAY LYMAN WILBUR,
Secretary of Interior, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: At yesterday's conference I tried to emphasize the three following points:

First. That it is for the best interests of our country as a whole to have the power utilized at the dam site rather than transmitting the power hundreds of miles to other localities.

Transmission costs for electric power are higher than transportation costs for raw material or finished product. Numerous illustrations might be cited. The large electrochemical plants producing carbide, abrasives, ferro-alloys, alkali and chlorine, and numerous other products which are at the very foundation of our entire industrial structure are being produced to-day at the dam sites, such as Niagara Falls, N. Y.; Alcoa, Tenn.; South Charleston, W. Va.; etc., and not at the source of raw material or at the market center.

Second. That the mineral resources of Nevada and neighboring States within permissible freight haulage distance of the dam site are more than sufficient to insure the establishment of factories on a paying basis, producing ferro-alloys, carbide, and other products of the electric furnace and electrolytic cell.

Third. That the demand for large blocks of power by the electrochemical industries has been increasing every year. Many of our own electrochemical manufacturing corporations have been obliged to go outside of the United States in order to obtain such large blocks of power. Thus, for example, the Aluminum Co. of America, the American Cyanamid Co., and the Union Carbide Corporation have gone beyond the border to locate plants at new hydroelectric power sites. It is my opinion and conviction that the American electrochemical industry will be ready to absorb all of the power developed by the Boulder Canyon project as soon as it is available.

Respectfully yours,

COLIN G. FINK.

NOVEMBER 14, 1929.

HON. RAY LYMAN WILBUR,
Secretary of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Further confirming the views expressed in my letter to you of November 12, 1929, concerning the desirability of considering the development of the mineral resources in the immediate territory of the Boulder Canyon Dam in making allocations of the power to be developed, I herewith submit a telegram just received from Dr. E. E. Free, lecturer in science at New York University.

Doctor Free is one of the foremost physicists in the country and is engaged in electrochemical and electrometallurgical research. I have a very high regard for his ability in this field and shall greatly appreciate your giving careful consideration to the views which he has expressed.

Should you desire at any time to obtain more detailed information, I feel sure that arrangements could be made for Doctor Free to come to Washington.

Very sincerely yours,

TASKER L. ODDIE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., November 13, 1929.

HON. TASKER L. ODDIE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Replying to your request, it is my opinion that allocation of the major portion of power expected to be developed at Boulder Canyon Dam to sites or uses at a distance therefrom is not in the interest of American industry. With the probable exception of power necessary to pump badly needed water over the mountain for use in lower California, the most useful employment of this power, in my judgment, would be for electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries close to the site of the dam. American industry is already seeking supplies of cheap power outside the limits of the United States for electrochemical and electrometallurgical purposes. Need of such power sources continually increasing. Industries of these classes have not been so actively developed in the West as would be justified by supplies of raw material and other factors. Not only would the Boulder Canyon power serve, in my opinion, to create a unit in industries of these classes which unit would be profitable in itself, but also this development probably would serve as a starting point for similar electrochemical and electrometallurgical developments elsewhere. No adequately complete survey of available raw materials for such industries in the neighborhood of the proposed dam has been made so far as I know. However, information which has come to me plus my own experience in the region convinces me that considerable supplies of such raw materials could be developed. Among these are zinc ores, borate ores, manganese ores, alkaline minerals, and other soluble salts, including magnesium compounds.

Complex metallurgical ores known to be available in the region might be utilized, I believe, were ample cheap power available. It is even possible that iron ores which exist in southern California might come ultimately to utilization with ample cheap power. An aluminum industry based on Boulder Canyon power is also a probability, either by shipment of purified aluminum oxide from plants already existing or by the development of supplies of this material

from local minerals such as feldspar and alunite. A field in which I have personally had some experience is the production in electric or other furnaces of fused quartz and other varieties of special glass-like materials useful in the handling of ultra-violet rays. Raw materials for such purposes are available and probably would be utilized by local availability of cheap power. The above opinions are freely at your disposal for any interest which they may have to the Nevada authorities or to the Department of the Interior. With my best regards personally.

Respectfully yours,

E. E. FREE.

BRIEF ON ALLOCATION AND PRICE OF BOULDER DAM POWER, NOVEMBER 12, 1929

By Geo. W. Malone, secretary Colorado River Development Commission and State engineer, Carson City, Nev.

CARSON CITY, NEV., November 7, 1929.

HON. RAY LYMAN WILBUR,
Secretary of Interior, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We have carefully reviewed your memorandum submitted to the bidders for Boulder Dam power on October 21, and in response to your suggestion, are submitting herewith in some detail an outline of the two ways suggested in our original proposal on July 5, of this year.

We believe that in either one of the two ways our "preference rights" mentioned in your memorandum can be recognized, and we hope you will give our proposal your serious consideration.

We are also submitting, in connection with this "brief" a copy of a report on Mineral Resources of Southern Nevada and a copy of our original application for Boulder Dam power, dated July 5, 1929, for reference.

Yours respectfully,

THE NEVADA COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION,
 By GEORGE W. MALONE, *Secretary*.

FOREWORD

Out of the first conference on the matter of allocation and price to be paid for Boulder Dam power, held in Washington, October 14, 1929, by the Secretary of the Interior, seems to have come a general confusion and misunderstanding as to the actual intention and status of the several bidders for that power.

This brief is prepared in the hope that at least six definite points will be cleared up, viz:

1. Nevada's actual need for a large amount of the power to be generated, for her development, and that this power must be made available before such investment can come, and that she is only interested in being allocated the amount she considers necessary for her future development.

2. Nevada's ability to finance any substantial amount of such power that may be allocated to her, from one-third to the total amount to be generated. She only expects to be allocated one-third of the total amount, as a matter of equity, although she can use more.

3. Nevada's bid is made under the provisions of the Federal water power act in determining between conflicting bidders, which was made a part of the act itself, and as such would have the same standing as any other bidder, plus the preference given a State to provide for her future needs, with no restrictions; and has no reference to the special one-third preference for use within the State, also made a part of the act.

4. That Nevada has only two dam sites within the entire State where power can be produced at a price so that it can be used for the development of her natural resources, and they are located on the Colorado River, which forms the boundary between our State and Arizona.

5. That it is not necessary to make any concessions to any certain area or organization to make possible the financing of the project.

6. That we do believe that when it is necessary for the Government to enter into the development of a project on account of navigation, flood control, or any other good reason, and that power is developed, then the States wherein the project is located and whose natural resource is being utilized should be allowed to retain an amount of such power that in her judgment may be needed for her future development if she is willing to pay the fair value of such power. The precedent set at this time will probably govern the procedure in any future development entered into by the Government where Federal and State rights are involved.

It is the hope of our people that at least one-third of the power to be generated can be made available for the development of our State, and they are ready to take the responsibility.

There is only one place that electric furnace development in the electrochemical and the electrometallurgical industry can be made a part of this project, and that is at the dam. The reason for this is that the raw materials that go into the products of the electric furnace can be transported cheaper and at greater distances than can power. For example, to-day tungsten from Nevada is shipped to Niagara Falls, N. Y., and profitably made into ferrotungsten with Niagara Falls power. With the electric furnaces at the dam, without transmission costs, the

raw materials from this whole western area could be brought together at the dam and made into the hundreds of newly developed chemicals and alloys which are produced by this industry.

It is not the intention of the State of Nevada to go into the power business, we do not advocate public ownership, but our intention is to make Boulder Dam power available to consumers at "cost at the switchboard," the same as any other purchasers, if, as, and when required.

Nevada's estimated power needs

	Horsepower
Pumping that part of Nevada's allocation of 300,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water for irrigation from the reservoir, that will become feasible within a reasonable time, estimated.	50,000
Pumping underground water for irrigation and domestic use, as outlined in detail by Cecil W. Creel, director agricultural extension, University of Nevada, on page 32, Nevada's Original Application for Power, July 5, 1929, and is conservative.	25,000
Mining development, not including the nonmetallic mining industry, as outlined in detail by Henry Rives, secretary Mine Operators' Association, in Nevada, page 30, Nevada's Application for Power, July 5, 1929, and appears conservative.	110,000
Electric-furnace development in the vicinity of the dam, as definitely outlined by the Union Carbide Co., New York, and the Nevada-Massachusetts Co. (Inc.), in Nevada, which now produces 64 per cent of the tungsten in the United States and ships it to Niagara Falls for reduction.	50,000
Estimated needs for further power for electric-furnace works in the electrometallurgical field, according to Colin G. Fink and other authorities.	250,000
	483,000

The fixation of atmospheric nitrogen through oxidation of ammonia obtained by direct union of nitrogen and hydrogen, which can be utilized for the manufacture of fertilizer and munitions, according to Colin G. Fink and others.

You are respectfully referred to our original application for power, dated July 5, 1929, for supporting letters from George Wingfield, mining man and banker; Henry Rives, secretary Mine Operators' Association; C. B. Lakenon, consulting mining engineer; John A. Fulton, director State bureau of mines; and Cecil W. Creel, director agricultural extension work in Nevada, and to brief dated October 9 and submitted to you in engineering report on "price and utilization of Boulder Dam power," submitted October 16, for further supporting letters.

ALLOCATION AND PRICE OF BOULDER DAM POWER

It is not intended in this brief to review in any way the legal rights of the States, municipalities, or private corporations; this matter will be covered by Senators PITTMAN and ODDIE, and a brief will be filed with your department covering this subject. It is presumed, however, that the Government has no greater interest in any one area than another, and that their only interest is in carrying out the terms of the act, including providing the Government with proper financial safeguards.

REASON FOR DEVELOPMENT

The original and only reason for the development of the Boulder Dam project in the first instance by the Government is "navigation and flood control" for the Imperial irrigation district in California and the Yuma irrigation district in Arizona. This has been testified to any number of times by all parties interested. The higher dam to develop power to assist in paying for the project is secondary, and on that account alone it was deemed proper for the Government to enter into power development as on other projects financed by the Bureau of Reclamation for irrigation development.

POWER TO CONSUMERS AT COST

We are still interested in just one thing, and that is to make Boulder Dam power available at cost at the switchboard to our consumers, the same as to other purchasers, for the development of our natural resources. It is not practicable, however, to place one area in a position where it may be subject to the "good graces" of another; neither is it practicable to expect the development to come before the power is made available, but if power is made available at a reasonable cost development will follow.

TWO DAM SITES IN NEVADA

In addition to the manufacture of cheap fertilizer for the farms, it is also probable that the manufacture of munitions can be carried on in connection with the Hawthorne munition storage depot in Nevada now under construction by the Government, so it will be seen from present known uses that it appears that Nevada can make use of much more than her share of the power that can be developed at both Boulder Dam and at the Bullshead Dam site, and since these are the only points within her borders that power can ever be developed at a price that can be used in the development of her natural resources, she can not neglect the opportunity. It is far-fetched to say that she will ever be allowed to benefit from any construction not located within her borders.

POTENTIAL POWER IN WESTERN STATES

Nevada is probably the only Western State that does not have numerous power sites, where from 25,000 to 150,000 horsepower can be developed, so that any one site is not so important, but we have only the two mentioned above for our entire future development.

STATE DEVELOPMENT

We were admitted to the Union 65 years ago and at this time have less than 80,000 population, due largely to the fact that our natural resources have never in the main been utilized within the State. Our corporations are even at this time largely in nonresident ownership. Nevada is the fifth largest State in the Union and is one of the most highly mineralized, and contains over 70,000,000 acres of land, yet includes the least taxable property of any State, due to the reasons just outlined.

FUEL SUPPLY

We have absolutely no fuel of any kind within our State, sufficient for commercial use, and while prospecting by drilling has been carried on almost continuously for the past 15 years, no oil, gas, or coal has been discovered, and it is well known that we have no timber of a commercial value within our forest reserves, and none can be developed on account of the limited rainfall. Our limited possibilities for hydroelectric development, then, constitutes our only fuel supply and hope for future development.

MUST UTILIZE STATE'S RESOURCES

If we are ever to develop our State and get out of the class of "Federal-aid" States, if we are ever to get in a position to pay our own way so that when any major improvement is made within our State, the Federal Government will not of necessity have to furnish the greater part of the capital, we must be allowed to utilize our own resources.

It would be extremely unfortunate not only for Nevada but for the United States as a whole, in view of our enormous potential mineral resources and our opportunity to attract electric reduction plants and manufacturing works to increase our taxable wealth, and our extensive underground water resources, if we were deprived of our only source of fuel development at a reasonable cost, while the Government continued to finance our projects, to say nothing of establishing the precedent of allowing private interests to take the resources of one State for the benefit of the people of another, when that State stood ready to finance the development.

STATE OF MAINE RETAINS POWER

The State of Maine has for 20 years had a provision in her statutes prohibiting the export of power developed within her borders to outside points, and only recently a referendum was had on this particular law and it was retained. In the discussion of the controversy by the various magazines some have agreed that Maine has perhaps gone too far in absolutely prohibiting the use of power, developed within her borders, outside her State, but all have agreed that she is probably within her rights in insisting that she control such power so that it could be recovered for use within the State in case such use should become necessary.

The State of Nevada has not taken any such action and does not contemplate treating her natural resources in any such manner, neither is she asking any favors, but is only requesting that she be allowed to pay the full price for such amount of power developed within her borders as she may consider necessary for her future development.

Nevada people have now determined to sponsor the development of their State and it is not a question of whether the immediate development should go to Nevada or to California; it is rather a question of whether or not Nevada is ever to be allowed to develop at all, since they have no other source of fuel supply.

ELECTRIC-FURNACE COMPANIES

Dr. Colin G. Fink, of Columbia University and secretary of the Electro-Chemical Engineers of America, points out that large electric-furnace companies have been forced to go to Norway and Sweden and to Canada to find power at a cost that can be used for their purpose and further if transmission costs are added to Boulder Dam power it can not be used by these companies, so that it again becomes not a question as to which State, Nevada or California, will get the power but rather a question as to whether or not these companies can operate within the United States at all.

PROVISIONS OF ACT SHOULD CONTROL POWER PRICE

If the provisions of the Boulder Dam project act are adhered to in fixing the price of power to conform to the cost of power in the "competitive centers" and kept at that figure by the readjustment periods every 10 years, as provided by the act, then there would be no apparent advantage to California in securing Boulder Dam power for that market, and it is well known that California has almost unlimited fuel supply with which to develop her resources and her development would not be retarded in the least by the lack of Boulder Dam power, whereas Nevada's development is absolutely dependent upon securing her share of this power.

REPORT ON NEVADA MINERALS

A report has just been published on Mineral Resources of Southern Nevada by the Nevada State Bureau of Mines in conjunction with the Mackay School of Mines, University of Nevada, a copy of which is submitted with this report.

NEVADA'S ALLOCATION OF POWER

Nevada will relinquish her preference rights included in the Boulder Dam project act as defined by the Federal water power act and the special preference to purchase provision included in the act itself, and accept in lieu thereof a withdrawal privilege, upon the following conditions:

1. That she be allowed to withdraw power up to one-third of the total amount generated, at any time during the life of the contract upon giving reasonable notice to the Government; 12 months has been suggested, and by specifying the amount to be withdrawn, and making proper contracts with the Government therefor.

2. That she shall pay for the cost of the power delivered at the switchboard on amounts so withdrawn the same price as that paid by other contractees of the Government.

3. That the amount so withdrawn can be returned without notice and can be withdrawn again, together with any part of the total one-third allocation except that all over 5 per cent of the total amount withdrawn that shall have been returned will require the 12 months' notice, as in the first instance, and this procedure obtains during the life of the contract; the 5 per cent will help take up the slack for small users so they would not be forced to wait the 12 months.

4. That the power so withdrawn by the State of Nevada shall be taken upon the same terms as any other purchaser, with no special limitation upon the place or manner of use, not imposed upon all other purchasers. Nevada is probably the only State in the Union that could not be sure of utilizing the entire one-third of the power developed within the State when ready for delivery, but she should not be further handicapped on that account; rather should be encouraged to develop in the public interest.

5. That a proper price per kilowatt-hour be paid by all purchasers for the "falling water" along the lines proposed by your department, as laid down by the Boulder Dam project act. We consider the proper competitive price in the competitive centers computed back to "falling water" at Boulder Dam to be at least 1.75 mills per kilowatt-hour. This would increase the income approximately \$432,000 annually, 62½ per cent of which, or \$269,960, would accrue to what is designated in the act as the "Boulder Dam fund."

6. That a proper price be paid for water taken out of the Colorado River watershed for domestic use. A price of \$2 per acre-foot has been suggested; this cost computed upon the prevailing per capita allowance of 120 gallons in the area to be served would amount to approximately 10 cents per consumer per month.

7. That the proposed board of control be made up of one member each from the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California; that the Secretary of the Interior act as the fourth member; and that the President of the United States appoint the fifth member of the board at large.

PREFERENCE NOT EFFECTIVE WITH UNFAVORABLE CONDITIONS

It is of no practical value to recognize that our State has a preference to purchase and then to surround that preference with conditions that make the utilization of that right impossible.

If we are allowed to withdraw a certain amount of power but are required to take all of it within 12 months, and confined to our State boundaries for its use, then we must prepare to put it all in use at one time, and then stop development or, in lieu of such development, prepare to pay for unused power, either of which is obviously unfair. We must of necessity include the provisions outlined above to provide for contingencies.

NOT GOOD POLICY TO RESTRICT SALES

If it should be within the province of your department to specify place of use, it would not be sound policy to confine the sale of power of any particular purchaser within any particular State, county, or municipal lines for at least three reasons, namely:

1. In the western area mountain ranges and not State lines define the limits of economic areas.

2. By a system of exchange and use of transmission lines already largely in existence, power can be secured for use in northern California and Nevada, in lieu of Boulder Dam power delivered to the power market in southern California for a slightly increased cost.

3. Some of the Boulder Dam power sold to California interests will, without doubt, find its way back into Nevada over existing lines, thereby serving Nevada territory at an increased cost.

SALE PRICE OF POWER AND COST OF PROJECT NOT CONNECTED

It was intended that the price paid for the power developed at Boulder Dam would be determined by the estimated cost of other power to supply the competitive centers, and readjustment periods were fixed to conform to that price. No connection is made with the cost of the project and the price of power except if it can not be sold for enough to cover the estimated cost, the project can not be constructed. The best evidence of what is meant by Congress is found in the Senate committee report on the bill as outlined on page 24 of Senate Document No. 186, as follows:

"The theory of this amendment is to keep the rates as high as economic conditions will justify in order, first, that the Government will receive its money at as early a date as possible; secondly, that there

will be excess profits for the States of Arizona and Nevada; and, also, that the contractee will not unnecessarily suffer in the event economic conditions would require a lowering of the rates."

It will be seen that the committee was very clear in that the power is to be sold for what it was worth in the "competitive centers"; and the act further provides that 62½ per cent of all moneys above the payments due the Government above what is necessary to repay the \$25,000,000 allocated to flood control shall be placed in a special fund known as the Boulder Dam fund, to be expended within the Colorado River Basin as Congress may later direct. We agree with your department in that there should be a uniform price established for all of the "firm" power, but it should be arrived at as contemplated by the act itself, and a fund should be built up if possible so that either the period of amortization can be shortened or further investigations can be undertaken, "as Congress may later direct."

WATER SHOULD BRING REASONABLE PRICE

It follows that the act intends that the water taken out of the watershed shall bring a reasonable price, and it is pointed out that contracts made now are not subject to revision, but are for permanent service, and no one contends that water will later become more plentiful.

BOARD OF CONTROL

The proposed board of control would have charge of the operation of a \$122,000,000 Government investment, and it naturally follows that it should not be given entirely into the hands of private interests. Into the hands of this board might naturally pass most of the responsibility for fixing rates during readjustment periods in the sale price of power. There will no doubt be a large amount of secondary, or "dump power," to be disposed of, in addition to the primary, or "firm" power, and the Government should benefit materially from this product, and the purchasers alone should not be allowed to determine its worth. Also if periods of unprecedented water shortage should occur, they would probably determine in a large measure the proportion of the power that would be delivered to each purchaser and could work terrific hardship on any area not properly represented.

NEVADA'S OFFER TO CONTRACT WITH THE GOVERNMENT

If, in the judgment of your department, it is not practicable to meet the above suggestions, we are prepared, and do offer at this time to make contracts satisfactory to your department for all of the "firm" power to be generated at Boulder Dam.

We are prepared to install and operate the power plants, furnishing your department satisfactory guarantees for proper financing.

This offer can be applied in either of two ways:

1. The allocation can be made to our State and we will immediately call a special session of our legislature, then follow whatever procedure may be necessary to make the proper changes in our constitution, if required; and in this event, must necessarily take advantage of the six months' provision, and the reasonable time allowed in paragraph (c), section 5, of the act, for a State or political subdivision thereof to authorize and market the necessary bonds; this may occasion delay comparable to the time required for such changes, in the natural course of procedure. In this connection it may be pointed out that any State bid would be subject to a State election, and that any municipal bid is subject to a municipal election in any State, whether in Nevada or California.

2. The allocation can be made to a Nevada organization as proposed in a previous memorandum to your department. This would have the same standing as any private organization and in addition the further preference that the State's application would be withdrawn in its favor. This organization will forthwith enter into a contract satisfactory to your department as provided in the act, for "falling water," as proposed in your recent memorandum, so that no delay may be occasioned and that Congress in its coming regular session may make the necessary appropriation, and construction of the project may proceed without delay. The organization is ready to put up a bid bond or certified check mentioned in your memorandum to secure execution of the required contract, if required by your department.

The price to be paid for "falling water" to be 1.75 mills per kilowatt-hour.

We believe that the State of Nevada can eventually use more than the one-third of the total amount of power to be generated, mentioned in our previous bid; we do not, however, want to appear to be trying to acquire more than our rightful share, which, since there are three States involved, we believe to be one-third of the amount generated. We have, however, made a firm bid on the total amount to be generated in order to dissipate the theory once and for all, that it is necessary to make any concessions to certain organizations or areas to make the construction possible. Therefore, the "bid" outlined above applies to any amount from one-third up to the total amount of power generated.

This bid is made under the provisions of the Federal water power act as made a part of the Boulder Dam project act in paragraph (c), section 5, of the act, and has no reference to the special preference of one-third mentioned later in the same paragraph of the Boulder Dam project act, and it is our conclusion that if each State could use more than one-third of the total amount, neither in equity would be entitled to more than that amount.

It is not the intention of the State of Nevada to go into the power business; we do not advocate public ownership; but our intention is to make Boulder Dam power available to consumers at "cost at the switchboard" the same as to other bidders for this power, if, as, and when required.

Respectfully submitted,

THE NEVADA COLORADO RIVER
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION,
By GEORGE W. MALONE, Secretary.

HON. RAY LYMAN WILBUR,

NOVEMBER 16, 1929.

Secretary of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Nevada Colorado River Development Commission on November 12 submitted a proposal to contract for the power to be developed at Boulder Canyon Dam under the provisions of the Boulder Dam project act, from which I quote the following:

NEVADA'S OFFER TO CONTRACT WITH THE GOVERNMENT

"If, in the judgment of your department, it is not practicable to meet the above suggestions, we are prepared and do offer at this time to make contracts satisfactory to your department for all of the 'firm' power to be generated at Boulder Dam.

"We are prepared to install and operate the power plants, furnishing your department satisfactory guaranties for proper financing.

"This offer can be applied in either of two ways:

"1. The allocation can be made to our State, and we will immediately call a special session of our legislature, then follow whatever procedure may be necessary to make the proper changes in our constitution, if required; and in this event must necessarily take advantage of the six months' provision and the reasonable time allowed in paragraph (c), section 5, of the act, for a State or political subdivision thereof to authorize and market the necessary bonds. This may occasion delay comparable to the time required for such changes in the natural course of procedure. In this connection it may be pointed out that any State bid would be subject to a State election, and that any municipal bid is subject to a municipal election in any State, whether in Nevada or California.

"2. The allocation can be made to a Nevada organization as proposed in a previous memorandum to your department. This would have the same standing as any private organization and, in addition, the further preference that the State's application would be withdrawn in its favor. This organization will forthwith enter into a contract satisfactory to your department as provided in the act, for 'falling water' as proposed in your recent memorandum, so that no delay may be occasioned and that Congress in its coming regular session may make the necessary appropriation, and construction of the project may proceed without delay. The organization is ready to put up a bid bond or certified check mentioned in your memorandum to secure execution of the required contract, if required by your department.

"The price to be paid for 'falling water' to be 1.75 mills per kilowatt-hour.

"We believe that the State of Nevada can eventually use more than the one-third of the total amount of power to be generated, mentioned in our previous bid; we do not, however, want to appear to be trying to acquire more than our rightful share, which, since there are three States involved, we believe to be one-third of the amount generated. We have, however, made a firm bid on the total amount to be generated in order to dissipate the theory once and for all that it is necessary to make any concessions to certain organizations or areas to make the construction possible. Therefore the 'bid' outlined above applies to any amount from one-third up to the total amount of power generated.

"This bid is made under the provisions of the Federal water power act as made a part of the Boulder Dam project act in paragraph (c), section 5, of the act, and has no reference to the special preference of one-third mentioned later in the same paragraph of the Boulder Dam project act, and it is our conclusion that if each State could use more than one-third of the total amount, neither in equity would be entitled to more than that amount.

"It is not the intention of the State of Nevada to go into the power business. We do not advocate public ownership, but our intention is to make Boulder Dam power available to consumers at 'cost at the switchboard,' the same as to other bidders for this power, if, as, and when required."

I wish particularly to call your attention to the fact that the bid of the Nevada-Colorado River Development Commission provides for the installation of the power equipment and offers to guarantee the payment for 100 per cent of the power to be developed at Boulder Canyon Dam.

Because of the superior credit position of a State in being able to obtain funds at lower rates of interest than municipalities or private power companies, the bid of the State of Nevada affords greater financial security to the Government in letting the contract to the State of Nevada than to any of the primary contractors in California which have been under consideration. Furthermore, to accept Nevada's offer would concentrate not only the financial but also the administrative responsibility in operating the power house as a single unit.

I wish also to call your attention to the fact that Nevada's bid for "falling water" is 1.75 mills per kilowatt-hour, as compared with the

figure which you have tentatively determined of 1.63 per kilowatt-hour. The acceptance of the Nevada bid will increase the revenue from the sale of the power approximately \$500,000 per year, which is an additional safeguard to the Government's investment and its return within the period of amortization. This increase in revenue under the Nevada bid would also constitute a reserve fund to meet unforeseen contingencies which might arise in the construction of the dam.

Furthermore, it was the intention of Congress that the rates for the sale of power at Boulder Dam should be kept as high as economic conditions would justify, as is evidenced by the report on the bill by the Senate committee and published in Senate Document 186, from which I quote on page 24 the following:

"The theory of this amendment is to keep the rates as high as economic conditions will justify, in order, first, that the Government will receive its money at as early date as possible; secondly, that there will be excess profits for the States of Arizona and Nevada; and also, that the contractee will not unnecessarily suffer in the event economic conditions would require a lowering of the rates."

There is no question but that Nevada's rate of 1.75 per kilowatt-hour for "falling water" is justified by economic conditions, and the acceptance of a contract for all of the power at the dam at this rate would provide a more adequate safeguard to the public interest and the Government investment than the acceptance of a contract based on the tentative rate which you have determined.

Until the status of the proposal to contract Boulder Canyon Dam power made by the Nevada Colorado River Development Commission is determined, it seems advisable that the officials of that commission remain in Washington, where they can be available to discuss details if the occasion should arise. Under these circumstances, I should greatly appreciate an early decision concerning the acceptance of Nevada's bid and the power to be allocated to her under the proposal made herein by the Nevada Colorado River Development Commission, subject to the guaranties specified in your initial memorandum of October 14, 1929, or any other reasonable guaranties which you may demand.

Very sincerely yours,

TASKER L. ODDIE.

Mr. ODDIE. The members of the Nevada Colorado River Development Commission are: Hon. Frederick B. Balzar, Governor of Nevada, chairman; Hon. George W. Malone, State engineer, secretary; Hon. E. W. Clark.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, do I understand that the power allocations are closed and that there will not be any changes from those already made?

Mr. ODDIE. No; they are not closed. The offer has been suggested, and the matter is still in abeyance.

Mr. DILL. I saw in the press that the Secretary of the Interior had accepted certain bids from the Edison Co. in the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. ODDIE. They have not been formally and finally accepted yet. The matter is being discussed at the present time.

Mr. DILL. It seems to me important that the small municipalities be given the same right that Los Angeles has been given, and not have to buy their power from the Edison Co.

SALE OF AMERICAN SHIPS TO RUSSIA

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have here a very startling piece of news which I think ought to be incorporated in the RECORD. The American Shipping Board has sold 25 ships to Russia and on a credit of one year's time. I suppose that is an implied statement to the effect that the Russian Government will last one year more. I ask that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The article is as follows:

[From the New York Times, November 14, 1929]

TWENTY-FIVE AMERICAN SHIPS SOLD TO RUSSIANS—SHIPPING BOARD DISPOSES OF CARGO VESSELS, LAID UP SEVEN YEARS, FOR \$1,155,000—STIMSON APPROVES SALE—PURCHASE BY AMTORG CORPORATION CHIEF IS SEEN AS STEP TOWARD SOVIET MERCHANT MARINE

WASHINGTON, November 13.—With the approval of the State Department, the Shipping Board to-day sold 25 laid-up cargo vessels to Johann G. Ohsol, of New York, an American citizen, who is vice president of the Amtorg Trading Corporation, for operation under Russian registry in the coastwise trade of that country.

The price was \$1,155,000, payable at 25 per cent in cash and the rest in one year, the figure being about \$900,000 more than the board estimated it would have received had it sold the ships for scrap.

Before making the sale the board ascertained that the State Department had no objection, holding that it was purely a business transaction without any other implications. About four years ago the board sold a small number of vessels for similar use to the Amtorg Co. By disposing of them to Russia the American Government believes that it will be stimulating trade conditions in that country, something it has always sought to encourage quite apart from its policy of not recognizing the Soviet Government under present conditions.

Purchase of the vessels is looked upon here as the first step by Russia in launching a merchant-marine program, rumors of which recently have been current, with intimations that Moscow was prepared to spend \$20,000,000 within the next few months in putting it into effect.

The ships are to be operated between Vladivostok, Siberia, and Petropavlovsk, Kamchatka, Siberia, and between Black Sea ports and Leningrad, Vladivostok, and Persian Gulf ports. None of them has been in active operation for approximately seven years.

The vessels were sold on an "as is, where is" basis, and it was provided that after one outward cargo of tin plate, agricultural machinery, steel and machine tools such cargoes should be discharged only at Vladivostok and Petropavlovsk. The smaller-type vessels of the group are not again to trade to or from ports of the United States for five years, and the larger-type vessels are similarly restricted for 10 years. Bonds in the sum of \$5,000 each for the smaller vessels and \$35,000 each for the larger vessels will be furnished by the purchaser as assurance for performance of the contract.

The vessels included in the group are as follows:

Lake-type vessels of approximately 4,200 deadweight tons, equipped with reciprocating engines and Scotch oil-burning boilers—*Lake Elmont, Lake Farley, Lake Farabe, Lake Geyser, Lake Gert, Lake Fabius, McCrory County, Lake Gasette, Lake Fansdale, Lake Fandom, Lake Favonia, Lake Fighting, Lake Fagundus, Lake Gilt, Franklin County, and Lake Festina.*

Large-type steel cargo vessels ranging from 7,323 deadweight tons to 7,562 deadweight tons, equipped with reciprocating engines and Scotch coal-burning boilers—*Glen Ridge, Bellingham, Masuda, Dallas, Puget Sound, Galesburg, Alcedo, Palisades, and Chebault.*

NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on the convening of the Senate to-morrow I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of unobjected nominations on the Executive Calendar.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 2171) to amend section 200 of the World War veterans' act of 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana:

A bill (S. 2172) granting a pension to Elizabeth Salyers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

A bill (S. 2173) to abolish the Papago Saguaro National Monument, Arizona, to provide for the disposition of certain lands therein for park and recreational uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. ODDIE:

A bill (S. 2174) relating to the promotion of captains on the active list of the Navy wounded in the line of duty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

INTERMENT IN EUROPEAN CEMETERIES OF WORLD WAR SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AND MARINES FROM WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. GOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have published in the RECORD a list of 301 names, enumerated by the Secretary of War, of soldiers, sailors, and marines from the State of West Virginia who died on European battle fields in the late war and whose bodies are interred in European cemeteries.

I desire in this connection to make this explanatory statement. Under the date of Saturday, November 9, I made substantially a similar offer of what I am now asking unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Fess], who was in the chair, and permission was given. No objection was interposed, and it was ordered that the list be printed.

The list was returned by the Public Printer with the statement attached that under the date of June 18, 1929, this list had been printed in the RECORD. The list as then printed in the RECORD was incorrect, and it was incorrect in this particular: That it included names beginning with the letter "C," the letter "E," the letter "L," the letter "Y," and others, of men who came from other States—Ohio, New Jersey, Virginia, and Pennsylvania.

I have had the assistance in gathering these data together of the Hon. J. Stanley Stephens, a member of the House of Delegates of the State of West Virginia.

I ask now that this, a correct record of the soldiers, sailors, and marines from West Virginia, who lost their lives in the World War, and who are interred in European cemeteries, may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA SOLDIER DEAD BURIED IN EUROPEAN CEMETERIES DURING THE WORLD WAR

The following is a list setting forth the names, counties, organizations and places of interment of members of the American Expeditionary Forces enlisted from the State of West Virginia whose remains are interred in European cemeteries:

KEY TO PERMANENT AMERICAN CEMETERIES IN EUROPE

France

No. 1232. Meuse-Argonne American Cemetery, Romagne-sous-Montaucon, Meuse.

No. 1764. Aisne-Marne American Cemetery, Belleau, Aisne.

No. 34. Suresnes American Cemetery, Suresnes, Seine (near Paris).

No. 636. Somme American Cemetery, Bony, Aisne.

No. 608. Oisne-Aisne American Cemetery, Seringes-et-Nesles, Aisne.

No. 1233. St. Mihiel American Cemetery, Thiaucourt, Meurthe-et-Moselle.

Belgium

No. 1252. Flanders Field American Cemetery, Waereghem, Belgium.

England

No. 107—E. Brookwood American Cemetery, Brookwood (near London).

Deceased soldiers from West Virginia interred in permanent American cemeteries in Europe

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
BARBOUR COUNTY					
Dean, Wm. Franklin	Pvt. 18th Co., 5th Regt. U. S. M. C.	1232	23	27	D
BERKELEY COUNTY					
Holley, Lewis A.	Pvt. Co. B, 540th Engrs.	608	17	20	D
Thompson, Jas. E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, Pos. Ex. Serv.	1232	36	18	A
BOONE COUNTY					
Midkiff, Oscar	Pvt. Co. B, 111th Inf.	1232	27	33	F
Welch, Ross W.	Cpl. Co. B, 60th Inf.	1233	2	2	C
BRAXTON COUNTY					
Brown, Solomon H.	Pvt. Co. M, 128th Inf.	1232	8	31	H
Carr, Benj. H.	Cpl. Co. A, 60th Inf.	1233	31	17	C
Criss, Guy H.	Pvt. 1 cl. B. H. 60.	1232	21	39	C
Green, Luther H.	Cpl. Bty. F, 313th F. A.	1232	41	32	H
Hamric, Arch	Pvt. 11th Inf.	1232	10	9	B
Kraft, John E.	Cpl. Bty. C, 313th F. A.	1232	35	4	E
White, Luke	Pvt. Co. G, 329th Inf.	608	16	28	D
Young, Jas. M.	Pvt. Co. C, 329th Inf.	608	14	19	D
BROOKE COUNTY					
Cattell, Ezra B.	Pvt. Co. B, 4th Engrs.	608	33	29	B
Ledger, Jos. C.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 12th M. G. Bn.	608	25	12	D
Lemon, Gilbert W.	Cpl. 51st Co., 5th Regt. U. S. M. C.	1764	79	5	A
Stillitano, Salvatore	Pvt. Co. F, 167th Inf.	608	16	4	A
Watkins, Emrys M.	Cpl. Co. F, 166th Inf.	608	8	2	B
CABELL COUNTY					
Ferguson, Leroy	Cpl. Co. K, 128th Inf.	1232	28	21	D
Holley, Chester A.	Pvt. Co. B, 7th Inf.	1232	34	15	B
Jones, Charles C.	Pvt. Co. L, 23d Inf.	608	31	22	C
Mefford, Oscar E.	Pvt. Co. E, 319th Inf.	1232	10	32	B
Simpson, Harry T.	Pvt. Co. A, 2d Cprs. Sch. Det.	1233	18	19	D
CALHOUN COUNTY					
Duffield, Addie	Pvt. Co. L, 30th Inf.	1232	31	40	C
Edman, Bernie	Pvt. Co. D, 39th Inf.	1764	30	13	B
Settles, Jas. F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L, 30th Inf.	1764	22	2	B
CLAY COUNTY					
Elliott, Geo. W.	Pvt. Co. K, 128th Inf.	1232	28	28	C
Knotts, Wm.	Mech. Co. C, 69th Inf.	608	35	5	A
Osburn, Lawrence	Pvt. Co. G, 28th Inf.	608	35	29	C
DODDGE COUNTY					
Reed, Walter D.	Pvt. Co. L, 118th Inf.	107-E	3	1	B
FAYETTE COUNTY					
Alesci, Joe	Pvt. Co. K, 317th Inf.	1232	12	23	G
Carver, Jas. R.	Pvt. Co. E, 7th Inf.	608	11	12	A
Frye, Jas. B.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 2 Mil. Poi.	34	5	14	B
Hiser, London F.	Pvt. Co. M, 16th Inf.	608	38	26	D
Hannah, Willie H.	Pvt. Co. B, 16th Inf.	1232	36	44	B
Honaker, Jas. W.	Pvt. Co. A, 319th Inf.	1232	17	24	B
Neylon, Jas. L.	Pvt. M. D., 318th Inf.	1232	7	22	B
O'Brien, Earl C.	Pvt. Co. E, 7th Inf.	1764	85	2	A
Pyatt, Dink E.	Pvt. Co. G, 112th Inf.	1233	6	12	C
Rodes, Henry L.	Pvt. Co. K, 315th Inf.	1232	5	35	F
Selvey, Grover D.	Pvt. Co. M, 319th Inf.	1232	14	13	C
Wade, Jas.	Pvt. Co. C, 26th Inf.	608	17	26	D
GILMER COUNTY					
Ayers, Chas. L.	Pvt. Co. L, 109th Inf.	608	11	18	D
Carson, Tom	Pvt. Co. D, 16th Inf.	1232	29	37	H
Gordon, Bertie R.	Pvt. Co. A, 2 Cps. Sch. Det.	1233	31	29	A
Greenleaf, Edward J.	Pvt. A. R. C., Hosp. 5.	34	36	9	B
Shaver, Warder G.	Pvt. Co. H, 30th Inf.	608	6	12	A
Woolter, Geo. E.	Pvt. Co. D, 161st Inf.	608	1	20	D
GRANT COUNTY					
Shillingbury, Olin L.	Pvt. Bty. A, 313th F. A.	1232	8	41	B

Deceased soldiers from West Virginia interred in permanent American cemeteries in Europe—Continued

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
GREENBRIER COUNTY					
Abbaugh, Asa	Pvt. Co. A, 301st Sn. Tn.	636	4	1	A
Crookshanks, Okley P.	Pvt. M. G. Co., 306th Inf.	1232	18	18	B
Kerns, Perry	Pvt. Co. E, 125th Inf.	1232	18	40	A
McMillon, Asa L.	Pvt. Co. E, 167th Inf.	1232	38	46	D
Ragland, Asa L.	Pvt. Class Cp. 3 Dep. Div.	1232	34	7	A
Ragland, John	Pvt. Co. E, 166th Inf.	1232	27	39	G
Whanger, Harrison O.	Pvt. Co. L, 363d Inf.	1232	32	23	D
Zimmerman, Emory L.	Pvt. Co. C, 11th Inf.	1232	16	6	B
HAMPSHIRE COUNTY					
Horn, Wm. L.	Pvt. Co. H, 125th Inf.	1232	7	30	D
HANCOCK COUNTY					
Beldycki, Roman	Pvt. Co. I, 26th Inf.	608	16	34	A
Howard, Raymond	Pvt. Co. A, 16th Inf.	636	14	33	A
Marcelle, John H.	Pvt. Co. G, 166th Inf.	1764	4	11	A
Moutafes, John K.	Pvt. Co. A, 311th M. G. Bn.	1232	38	20	H
Pol, Ralph	Pvt. Co. D, 28th Inf.	1764	13	7	B
HARDY COUNTY					
McNeill, Jas. O.	Pvt. Co. F, 358th Inf.	1233	16	11	D
HARRISON COUNTY					
Adams, Earl L.	Cpl. Hq. Co., 802d Pion. Inf.	107-E	3	11	C
Burroughs, Roy E.	Pvt. Btry. B, 314th F. A.	1232	25	43	G
Garner, Herbert F.	Pvt. Co. L, 30th Inf.	1232	34	21	H
Hildreth, Dewey S.	Pvt. M. G. Co., 26th Inf.	1232	17	18	C
Jones, Earl	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F, 7th Inf.	608	29	28	A
Kelley, Andrew Jos.	Pvt. Co. F, 7th Inf.	608	10	12	A
Maldo, Nicolo	Pvt. Co. G, 47th Inf.	1232	38	26	H
Mash, Russell F.	Pvt. Co. B, 135th M. G. Bn.	1232	9	21	A
Mason, Lummey M.	Pvt. Co. L, 30th Inf.	1232	19	12	D
McCann, Mark	Cpl. Co. C, 313th M. G. Bn.	1232	24	8	A
Parrish, Roy	2d Lt., 6th F. A.	608	8	3	C
Ravenda, Antonio	Pvt. Co. B, 30th Inf.	1232	12	2	B
Robinson, Clyde	Pvt. Co. B, 102d Inf.	608	20	1	A
Squires, Freeman G.	Pvt. Co. D, 310th Rep. Sh. Unit.	(¹)			
JACKSON COUNTY					
Davis, Kenna	Pvt. Hq. Co., 4th Inf.	1232	24	25	H
Logston, Thos. D.	Pvt. 62d Pr. Co., J. R. D.	107-E	16	1	B
JEFFERSON COUNTY					
Grove, Clarence C.	Pvt. Co. I, 125th Inf.	1232	6	30	D
Snyder, Martin	Pvt. Co. A, 543d Engrs.	34	12	15	A
KANAWHA COUNTY					
Anderson, Lane S.	2d Lt. Co. G, 106th Inf, 27th Div.	636	10	33	A
Allen, Grant	Pvt. Co. B, 166th Inf.	608	37	1	B
Baier, Ernest Hubert	Pvt. Co. B, 47th Co., 5th Regt., U. S. M. C.	1764	43	12	B
Barber, Timothy L.	Capt., M. D., 313th Inf.	1232	4	32	F
Cavender, Jas. W.	Pvt. Co. I, 28th Inf.	1232	8	25	G
Clair, Bernard	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K, 802d Pion. Inf.	34	19	6	C
Davis, Walter	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 7th Inf.	608	33	17	B
Donoghue, Francis	Cpl. Co. G, 47th Inf.	608	22	11	D
Doss, Jas. L.	Pvt. Co. E, 2d Br. M. G. Bn.	1232	36	23	C
Dreibelbis, Harry O.	Pvt. M. D., 7th F. A.	1232	17	21	B
Fisher, Milford O.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L, 26th Inf.	1764	21	7	A
Gillispie, Wm. H.	Pvt. Co. F, 131st Inf.	1232	30	16	B
Huffman, Noah F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 2d Engrs.	1232	6	8	C
Kern, Thomas Dabney	1st Lt. M. G. Co., 26th Inf.	1764	22	6	B
Lavender, Roy	Pvt. 1 cl. Btry. D, 315th F. A.	1232	9	20	B
Lawson, Wm.	Pvt. 1 cl. Hq. Co., 39th Inf.	608	23	7	D
Leech, John H.	Pvt. Co. K, 23d Inf.	1764	16	1	B
Lozinski, John	Pvt. Co. K, 18th Inf.	1764	71	8	A
Philippe, Albert	Pvt. 1 cl. 313th Amb. Co., 304th Sn. Tn.	1232	1	20	C
Riheldaffer, Wm. A.	1st Lt. Hq. Co., 155th Inf. Bn.	1232	16	31	G
Rizk, Saelme	Pvt. Co. C, 319th Inf.	1232	2	12	A
Poe, Charles S.	Pvt. Co. F, 167th Inf.	1232	20	15	A
Robson, Jas. P.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 7th Inf.	1764	64	7	B
Sanson, Hershel	Pvt. Co. I, 27th Inf.	608	33	27	D
Thompson, Fred R.	Cpl. Btry. D, 315th F. A.	1232	36	16	B
Williams, Forest Grey	Cpl. 80th Co., 6th Regt., U. S. M. C.	608	9	5	D
Wines, Lawrence	Pvt. Btry. D, 315th F. A.	1232	18	45	B
Young, John W.	Pvt. Co. K, 301st Inf.	1232	5	24	A
Young, Waymon	Pvt. Co. A, 506th Engrs.	34	7	5	C
LEWIS COUNTY					
Emerson, Lewis D.	Pvt. Co. B, 2 Cps. Sch. Det. A. P. O. 730.	1233	32	2	A
Forinash, Albert C.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 320th Inf.	1232	27	11	E
Lewis, Harvey E.	Pvt. Co. B, 168th Inf.	1232	9	19	G
Rifle, Clell V.	Pvt. Co. D, 7th Inf.	1232	18	43	C
Riley, Thos. S.	Pvt. Btry. B, 313th F. A.	1232	10	38	E
Rohrbaugh, Frank	Pvt. Co. B, 168th Inf.	1232	16	30	G
Wheeler, Geo. H.	Pvt. Co. H, 125th Inf.	1232	10	24	H
LINCOLN COUNTY					
Neace, Wm. A.	Pvt. Co. C, 111th Inf.	1232	13	24	F
Ramsey, Ira F.	Pvt. Co. M, 23d Inf.	1232	19	27	A

¹ Kerfastras Cemetery, Brest, France.

Deceased soldiers from West Virginia interred in permanent American cemeteries in Europe—Continued

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
LOGAN COUNTY					
Alasky, Tony	Pvt. Co. I, 58th Inf.	1232	2	12	F
Cook, Newton	Pvt. M. G. Co., 16th Inf.	1232	26	27	A
Curia, Tony	Pvt. Co. M, 112th Inf.	1232	7	39	F
Hahne, Fred E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Btry. F, 315th F. A.	1232	32	16	B
Gunther, Edward	Pvt. M. G. Co., 16th Inf.	1232	14	43	G
Hensley, David	Pvt. Co. D, 12th Inf.	1232	35	31	E
Jeffrey, Clyde	Pvt. Co. C, 305th F. S. Bn.	1232	22	9	D
Martin, John	Pvt. Co. K, 28th Inf.	1232	28	2	G
Phillips, Haskell	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F, 26th Inf.	1232	22	38	D
Robinson, Jas. L.	Pvt. M. G. Co., 39th Inf.	1232	34	36	G
Vance, Ulysses B.	Wag. Co. G, 7th Inf.	1232	10	23	C
MARION COUNTY					
Bennett, Thos.	Cpl. Co. L, 320th Inf.	1232	30	12	D
Burke, Able L.	Pvt. Co. M, 128th Inf.	1232	28	17	C
Cook, Herman	Pvt. Co. A, 57th Engrs.	34	26	5	B
Dapuzzo, Gerardo	Pvt. Co. L, 320th Inf.	1232	15	41	G
Elder, Wm. W.	Pvt. Co. M, 128th Inf.	1232	2	43	D
Hawkins, Carley R.	Pvt. Co. H, 9th Inf.	1232	16	22	G
Kemper, Clark	Pvt. Co. G, 11th Inf.	1232	28	25	A
Millan, Chas. Van Buren	Sea. 2 cl., U. S. N. R. F.	608	13	11	C
Moore, John F.	Pvt. Co. D, 111th Inf.	1233	11	26	D
Workman, Jas.	Cpl. Co. I, 320th Inf.	1232	29	24	C
Wright, Raymond	Cpl. Co. B, 5th M. G. Bn.	1232	38	6	F
MARSHALL COUNTY					
Barovic, Peter	Pvt. Co. C, 111th Inf.	1233	31	5	C
Crow, Lester	Pvt. Co. H, 111th Inf.	1232	19	35	H
Datzko, Mike	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 60th Inf.	1232	9	23	A
Stewart, Geo. C.	Pvt. Co. A, 111th Inf.	1233	21	27	C
MASON COUNTY					
Ball, John H.	Pvt. Co. A, 119th Inf.	636	7	28	B
Mason, Clarence A.	Pvt. Hq. Tp., 2 Army Corps.	636	16	6	B
Mulford, Wade E.	Sgt. Co. C, 4th Inf.	1764	18	4	A
O'Neil, Homer	Pvt. Co. C, 166th Inf.	1232	12	27	H
Rainey, Geo. S.	Pvt. Co. A, 135th M. G. Bn.	1232	18	17	G
Roush, Warner E.	Cpl. Co. L, 118th Inf.	636	7	10	D
MERCER COUNTY					
Dillon, Mack	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 7th Inf.	1232	12	39	D
Galiano, Antonio	Pvt. Co. B, 7th Inf.	1232	13	13	H
Norton, Walter G.	Cpl. Co. H, 314th Inf.	1232	10	5	B
Peery, Guss	Pvt. Co. B, 30th Inf.	608	35	17	B
Robertson, Luther J.	Pvt. Co. G, 358th Inf.	1232	6	19	H
Robertson, Okie E.	Pvt. Co. C, 360th Inf.	1232	31	39	F
Shedd, Clyde E.	1st Lt. M. D., 327th Inf.	1232	30	32	A
Stewart, Geo. L.	Sgt. Co. L, 4th Inf.	1764	12	6	A
Robinson, Wm.	Pvt. Co. A, 16th Inf.	608	28	37	C
Repoli, Alphonso	Pvt. Co. C, 16th Inf.	608	14	23	B
White, Harry L.	Sgt. Co. H, 30th Inf.	608	29	1	B
White, Birchard H.	Pvt. Co. D, 315th Inf.	1232	30	33	G
Williams, Sherman H.	Pvt. Co. D, 135th M. G. Bn.	1252	15	4	A
MINERAL COUNTY					
Baldwin, Lewis R.	Pvt. 65 Pr. Co. Cp. MacArthur S. R. D.	1233	8	20	A
Baldwin, Raymond H.	Pvt. Co. D, 7th Inf.	1764	11	13	A
Gregory, Clarence W.	Pvt. Co. E, 59th Inf.	1232	66	1	A
Kelly, Jas. A.	2d Lt. Co. G, 39th Inf.	608	24	28	C
Runkelo, John	Pvt. Co. D, 7th Inf.	1764	96	12	A
MINGO COUNTY					
Elder, Pete	Pvt. Co. I, 28th Inf.	1232	35	10	F
Maynard, Alex	Pvt. Co. A, 16th Inf.	1232	5	28	A
Sloan, Lee	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 11th Inf.	1232	35	27	A
Wilson, Homer A.	Pvt. M. G. Co., 28th Inf.	1232	27	7	G
MONONGALIA COUNTY					
Manfroi, Faustino	Pvt. San Det., F. S. Bn.	1233	4	7	D
Mercer, Henry G.	Pvt. Co. L, 320th Inf.	1232	28	37	H
Riggs, Lawrence C.	Pvt. Co. C, 21st F. A.	1232	37	44	A
Saunders, Ralph H.	Pvt. Co. B, 166th Inf.	608	37	14	A
MONROE COUNTY					
Boggs, Edward L.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 192d Inf.	1232	16	5	E
Ramsey, Humphrey R.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 7th Inf.	1232	39	31	E
Tait, Lee Campbell	1st Lt. Co. F, 354th Inf.	608	29	33	B
MORGAN COUNTY					
Alderton, Marion L.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 305th F. S. Bn.	636	10	34	A
M'DOWELL COUNTY					
Baldwin, Wm.	Pvt. Co. C, 7th Inf.	1232	12	45	D
Barbaganaskin, Constanton	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. A, 315th F. A.	34	33	6	A
Blankenship, Charlie P.	Pvt. Co. I, 118th Inf.	636	11	5	C
Boyd, Spencer L.	Sgt. Co. D, 3d M. G. Bn.	1232	30	25	G
Bradshaw, Geo.	Pvt. Vet. Hosp. 19, A. E. F.	1232	19	7	B
Calloway, Homer	Pvt. Co. B, 506th Engrs.	34	5	20	A
Carter, Aaron	Pvt. Co. M, 319th Inf.	1232	6	21	B
Colfatto, Fillippo	Pvt. Co. B, 7th Inf.	608	35	6	A
Cole, Emmett	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 318th Inf.	1232	7	36	H
Davidovich, Andri	Pvt. Co. A, 18th Inf.	1232	5	42	B

Deceased soldiers from West Virginia interred in permanent American cemeteries in Europe—Continued

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
M'DOWELL COUNTY—CON.					
Hampton, Elwood	Cpl. Co. A, 59th Inf.	1232	21	25	E
Harris, Chas.	Pvt. Co. B, 506th Engrs.	34	7	18	A
Harvey, Robert	Pvt. 1 Fr. Co., Cp. Lee, A. R. D.	608	20	24	B
Hill, Benj.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F, 318th Inf.	1232	22	42	H
Johnson, Hal.	Pvt. Co. C, 542d Engrs.	1232	6	39	C
Lapinski, Mike	Wag. Bty. B, 315th F. A.	608	29	26	D
Malinus, Nick	Pvt. Co. B, 7th Inf.	1764	12	6	B
Palumbo, Bruno	Pvt. Co. M, 116th Engrs.	608	5	35	D
Parsons, Edgar	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 18th Inf.	1233	31	5	B
Sawinckly, Gratsian	Mech. Co. A, 26th Inf.	1232	9	46	D
Semianelky, Constantinos G.	Pvt. Co. C, 16th Inf.	608	28	10	C
Tramel, Tom	Pvt. Co. H, 16th Inf.	608	32	36	B
Sassara, Aneleto C.	Bglr. Co. E, 23d Inf.	608	8	10	O
NICHOLAS COUNTY					
Brown, Andy S.	Pvt. Co. F, 6th Inf.	1232	30	41	B
Martin, Benj. H.	Pvt. Co. E, 7th Inf.	636	23	23	A
Persinger, Andy L.	Pvt. Co. B, 16th Inf.	608	30	15	D
Spencer, Jas.	Pvt. Co. D, 7th Inf.	1764	10	11	A
Stutler, Ray M.	Pvt. 1 cl. B. H. 114	34	25	5	A
OHIO COUNTY					
Boyer, Francis	Pvt. Hq. Co., 316th Inf.	1232	37	14	A
Browning, Frank R.	Cpl. Bty. D, 147th F. A.	1232	4	37	H
Conaway, Wm. F.	Pvt. Co. A, 107th M. G. Bn.	1233	16	27	C
Fox, Albert	Pvt. Co. A, 166th Inf.	1232	30	18	C
Freese, Chester H.	Pvt. Co. B, 11th Inf.	1232	39	23	H
Hitchcock, Jas. W.	Pvt. Co. I, 26th Inf.	1232	1	21	D
McMillan, Thos. M.	Pvt. Co. E, 47th Inf.	1232	27	6	C
Nolte, Friend J.	Pvt. Co. F, 61st Inf.	1232	1	8	F
Rosa, Michelo	Pvt. Co. M, 4th Inf.	1232	15	16	B
Schmitt, Emil J.	Sgt. Co. F, 167th Inf.	1232	26	43	B
Seitz, Frederick Wm.	Cpl. 67th Co., 5th Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	16	12	B
Stanton, Jos. E.	Cpl. Co. K, 314th Inf.	1232	10	24	A
Westfall, Cornelius R.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. A, 17th F. A.	1232	40	29	G
Wilson, Wm. A.	Pvt. Co. M, 11th Inf.	1232	26	36	D
PLEASANTS COUNTY					
Highley, Peter W.	Pvt. Co. A, 11th Inf.	1232	36	22	G
POCAHONTAS COUNTY					
Acord, Chas. H.	Pvt. 1 cl. Hq. Co., 7th Inf.	1232	32	17	E
Edwards, Seth W.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L, 4th Inf.	1232	16	31	A
Lambert, Wm. O.	Pvt. Co. E, 165th Inf.	1232	16	26	A
PRESTON COUNTY					
Channel, Owen Creed	Pvt. Co. E, 58th Inf.	1764	20	4	A
Larew, Wm. G.	Pvt. Co. A, 111th Inf.	608	9	4	C
Mazzarella, Angelo	Pvt. Co. I, 362d Inf.	1232	21	4	C
Valdesere, Jas.	Pvt. Co. A, 4th Engrs.	1232	8	27	H
PUTNAM COUNTY					
Craig, Adra T.	Pvt. Co. K, 318th Inf.	1232	29	31	B
Saunders, Jesse	Pvt. Co. I, 6th Inf.	1232	19	41	C
Smith, Isaac C.	Pvt. Co. B, 360th Inf.	1232	5	2	C
Vance, Nuel S.	Pvt. M. G. Co., 126th Inf.	1232	8	45	B
Witt, Amos	Pvt. Co. B, 318th Inf.	1233	29	4	A
Zitzelsberger, Andrew	Pvt. Co. M, 16th Inf.	1232	15	34	A
RALEIGH COUNTY					
Allen, Nathan G.	Pvt. Co. G, 16th Inf.	1232	25	3	C
Bates, Thos. A.	Pvt. Co. K, 128th Inf.	1232	8	3	B
Greer, Robt. E.	Pvt. Co. E, 112th Inf.	1232	9	19	H
Horton, Sherman	Pvt. Co. H, 16th Inf.	608	1	26	C
Plumley, Giles E.	Pvt. Co. F, 61st Inf.	1232	29	15	F
Richardson, Chas. E.	Pvt. Co. M, 369th Inf.	1232	35	27	H
Starr, Armon V.	Mech. Bty. B, 315th F. A.	1232	33	7	A
RANDOLPH COUNTY					
Louk, Wm. F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 168th Inf.	1764	82	4	A
Stewart, Wm. H.	Pvt. Co. B, 7th M. G. Bn.	608	26	29	B
Triplett, Jacob B.	Pvt. Co. C, 166th Inf.	608	32	14	A
Weese, Wilbur W.	Pvt. Co. G, 125th Inf.	1232	28	11	B
RITCHIE COUNTY					
Brannon, Doy L.	Pvt. Co. G, 6th Inf.	1232	34	23	A
Busch, Roscoe E.	Pvt. 2d Co., 6th Pr. Ord. Det.	1233	31	9	A
Davis, Phillip	Pvt. Co. C, 119th Inf.	636	1	16	A
Guinn, Ellis	Pvt. Co. D, 542d Engrs.	608	4	42	D
Rush, Geo. W.	Pvt. M. G. Co., 118th Inf.	636	16	26	A
Simons, Ritchie	Pvt. Co. C, 125th Inf.	1232	23	26	E
ROANE COUNTY					
Coffee, Robt. L.	Pvt. Co. M, 128th Inf.	1232	9	38	F
Curlman, Wm. B.	Pvt. Co. G, 30th Inf.	1232	23	19	C
Holcomb, Fred G.	Pvt. Co. B, 166th Inf.	608	31	8	B
Rhodes, Wm. R.	Pvt. Co. B, 132d Inf.	1232	38	1	C
Rogers, Wm. P.	Pvt. Co. M, 128th Inf.	1232	20	1	E
SUMMERS COUNTY					
Bragg, Joshua P.	Pvt. Co. D, 7th Inf.	1232	8	39	F
Meadows, Cam B.	Pvt. Co. B, 6th Inf.	1232	17	34	A

Deceased soldiers from West Virginia interred in permanent American cemeteries in Europe—Continued

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
SUMMERS COUNTY—CON.					
O'Brien, Wm. H.	2d Lt., 372d Inf.	1232	27	43	D
Porter, Ezra	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 7th Inf.	1764	35	4	B
Williams, David Lee	Pvt. Co. A, 16th Inf.	608	4	15	D
Williams, Martin F.	do	34	26	15	B
TUCKER COUNTY					
Conti, Artebono	Mech. Co. I, 109th Inf.	1233	15	6	B
Valenzise, Fortunato	Pvt. Co. G, 147th Inf.	1232	23	14	E
TYLER COUNTY					
Hickmon, Floyd A.	Pvt. Co. C, 317th Inf.	1232	37	9	G
Travis, Wm. L.	Sgt. Co. D, 5 M. G. Bn.	1764	40	11	A
UPSHUR COUNTY					
Brady, Arthur D.	Cpl. Btry. F, 313th F. A.	1232	8	25	C
Perry, Chas. M.	Pvt. Co. E, 118th Inf.	636	13	6	C
WAYNE COUNTY					
Damron, Wm. H.	Pvt. Co. E, 6th Inf.	1232	39	29	G
Davis, Roy	Pvt. Co. L, 168th Inf.	1233	5	19	D
Hamm, Scott	Sgt. Btry. C, 315th F. A.	1232	1	10	B
Johnson, Chas.	Cpl. Btry. C, 315th F. A.	1233	10	21	A
Napier, Wm. B.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 65th Engrs.	34	30	11	A
Rader, Claude C.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I, 30th Inf.	608	36	2	A
WEBSTER COUNTY					
Fisher, Jesse	Pvt. Co. I, 319th Inf.	1232	15	31	H
Knight, Wm. H.	Pvt. Co. D, 7th Inf.	1232	21	13	A
McCutcheon, Thos. L.	Pvt. M. G. Co., 319th Inf.	1232	22	35	F
Miller, Roscoe O.	Pvt. Co. F, 38th Inf.	608	34	9	B
WETZEL COUNTY					
Lancaster, Francis W.	Pvt. Co. D, 329th Inf.	608	29	10	D
Moore, Elzy Van	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 101st Inf.	1232	34	19	H
WOOD COUNTY					
Calhoun, Jesse B.	Pvt. Co. A, 4th Inf.	1232	7	17	F
Cook, Bura S.	Pvt. 457th Engrs. Pont. Tn.	608	14	26	C
Davis, Warner	Pvt. Co. M, 128th Inf.	1232	25	33	E
Dye, Leon L.	Pvt. Hq. Co., Tr. Cps.	608	21	28	A
Fisher, Earl O.	Pvt. Co. M, 128th Inf.	1232	19	38	E
Johnson, Roy	Pvt. Co. H, 813th Pion. Inf.	608	10	26	C
Keramidas, Gus D.	Pvt. Co. E, 317th Inf.	1232	20	30	E
Kesser, Jas. C.	Pvt. Co. K, 128th Inf.	1232	24	37	G
Kinney, Swithen	Pvt. 29th Co., Med. R. D.	608	33	28	C
McGuinness, John P.	Pvt. Cas. Det.	1232	12	23	F
Meyer, Carle M.	Pvt. Co. M, 164th Inf.	1233	12	29	A
Moorehead, John	Pvt. Co. F, 18th Inf.	608	27	19	A
Tabler, Kramer C.	1st Lt. Air Serv.	1233	5	6	C
Lieber, Frank E.	Pvt. 2d Cav., 1st Dep. Div.	608	28	17	C
WYOMING COUNTY					
Altice, Ed.	Pvt. Bty. C, 315th F. A.	1232	6	9	B
Cozort, Okey E.	Pvt. Co. E, 18th Inf.	1232	17	29	H
Toler, Robt. L.	Pvt. Btry. B, 10th F. A.	1232	10	39	D

REVISION OF THE TARIFF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was on page 160, line 19, to strike out "3 cents" and insert "3½ cents," so as to read, "hackled hemp, 3½ cents per pound."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 161, line 14, after the word "(a)," to strike out:

Single yarns, in the gray, of flax, hemp, or ramie, or a mixture of any of them, not finer than 12 lea, 13 cents per pound; finer than 12 lea and not finer than 60 lea, 13 cents per pound, and one-half of 1 cent per pound additional for each lea or part of a lea in excess of 12; finer than 60 lea, 25 per cent ad valorem; and in addition thereto, on any of the foregoing yarns, when boiled, 2 cents per pound; when bleached, dyed, or otherwise treated, whether or not boiled, 5 cents per pound: *Provided*, That the duty on any of the foregoing yarns not finer than 60 lea shall not be less than 27½ nor more than 37½ per cent ad valorem.

And insert:

Single yarns, of flax, hemp, or ramie, or a mixture of any of them, not finer than 60 lea, 35 per cent ad valorem; finer than 60 lea, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it may look rather strange that the ad valorem rate on the finer lea is lower. It is unusual.

The only reason why the Senate committee acted as it did is because there are none made in the United States. There is no such thing as a lea finer than 60 made in the United States. Therefore we made it a lower rate than in the other provisions in which there is an American production.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, does this mean the Senate committee rate is lower than the House rate?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; and it is lower than we have had on the finer lea. The reason for that is that there is none of it made here.

Mr. COPELAND. Is the Senator feeling well this evening?

Mr. SMOOT. Very well.

Mr. COPELAND. He has recommended a lower tariff.

Mr. SMOOT. I have often done it.

Mr. COPELAND. I congratulate the Senator. Perhaps we had better let it alone.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the Senator will do so. I am very glad the Senator is pleased.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, my information is that the rate recommended by the Finance Committee is the same as the rate in the House text, so far as the finer yarns are concerned.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I think as far as the finer yarns are concerned it is less.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. My information is that the rate on the finer yarns is 25 to 35 per cent in the present law, in the House provision is 25 per cent, and the Senate committee amendment 25 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. That is, on the finer it was 35 per cent, but we make it 25 per cent, and I have stated the reason why the change was made. We cut out the specific rates on this item entirely and we give the ad valorem straight rate on the coarser lea and cut the finer leas to 35 per cent.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Was there not a maximum proviso in the present law of 35 per cent?

Mr. SMOOT. That 60 lea shall not be less than 27½ per cent nor more than 37½ per cent. That was the provision in the House text, but we strike that out and put in a straight 25 per cent ad valorem rate.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I want to inquire of the Senator how these ad valorem rates compare to the rates in existing law?

Mr. SMOOT. I think on very few of the numbers the rate in existing law is lower, but taking the whole schedule, taking the fine and the coarse together, there is a decrease. There are some numbers under existing law as to which, falling under 35 per cent, there would be an increase, and that is on the numbers made in the United States, but on the finer numbers it is a decrease.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I knew there was a hitch about it. I knew it was not possible that the Senator from Utah had actually recommended something lower than existing law. He has confessed that on certain items this is an increase. I think we ought to know about it. Certainly on nothing does he go beyond the present law. Can the Senator suggest a rewording which will protect us on those items which under this arrangement will go higher than existing law?

Mr. SMOOT. Not unless we go back to the House provision and put in the brackets there with a specific duty. It would hardly be fair to make that change as to administration and as to the protective tariff itself. I can assure the Senator that on the whole it is a decrease from the existing law. We have taken out the specific rate and put the ad valorem rate and the specific rate together in one ad valorem rate.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I quite agree that it is an improvement to consolidate the rates in this way; but I want to know if there has been any material increase or any increase at all over existing law.

Mr. SMOOT. No material increase, I will say to the Senator; and as a whole there has been a decrease.

Mr. GEORGE. As a whole it merely equals existing law?

Mr. SMOOT. No; it is a little less than existing law.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I do not want to dispute the figures presented by the Senator from Utah, but I can not allow the Record to close without stating that my information is that the equivalent ad valorem rate under the present law, so far as these yarns are concerned, is 27.77 per cent, the House rate 32.15 per cent, and the Finance Committee proposal is 34.60 per cent. It may be true, as the Senator has said, that the net of the rates recommended by the Senate Finance Committee in the finer yarns is a reduction, because it has removed the maximum proviso and taken the minimum ad valorem proviso; but so far as I get the information as to the coarser grade of yarns, there has been an increase because the House provision

had a minimum proviso of 27½ to 37½ per cent, while the Senate committee proposes a flat ad valorem of 35 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that the Senate just voted an increase on hemp and hemp tow from 1½ to 2 cents. The compensatory duty for that one-half cent there is not taken care of in the provision here for 35 per cent. I will assure the Senator that that is true.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I do not dispute the sincerity and honesty of purpose of the Senator, but the comparative rates do not seem to bear out quite exactly what the Senator said. Perhaps in the main they do indicate a reduction, but there are certain grades of yarn where there is an increase.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senate had voted against the 2-cent rate and had granted 1½ cents instead, then in reply to the question asked me by the Senator from New York as to certain of the lower rates I would have said there would not have been an increase, but with this increase from 1½ cents to 2 cents a pound I say now that all the rates are lower than existing law if we are going to compensate the manufactured goods for the increase upon the hemp and hemp tow.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I beg my friend from Massachusetts let us not go further. If the Senator had seen the beaming face of the Senator from Utah, he would not try to go further. Almost for the first time he has proposed lowering a rate. Let us not disappoint him. Let us vote this rate in and give him the satisfaction of feeling that he has lowered the tariff on something.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 162, line 6, after the word "together," to strike out—

The size of the single yarn of which is not finer than 11 lea, 21½ cents per pound; finer than 11 lea and not finer than 60 lea, 21½ cents per pound and three-fourths of 1 cent per pound additional for each lea or part of a lea in excess of 11; finer than 60 lea, 50 cents per pound; and in addition thereto, on any of the foregoing threads, twines, and cords, when boiled, 2 cents per pound; when bleached, dyed, or otherwise treated, whether or not boiled, 5 cents per pound: *Provided*, That the duty on the foregoing threads, twines, and cords shall not be less than 32½ per cent ad valorem—

And insert "40 per cent ad valorem," so as to read:

(b) Threads, twines, and cords, composed of two or more yarns of flax, hemp, or ramie, or a mixture of any of them, twisted together, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Utah what is the significance of this change? Does this lower the existing rate?

Mr. SMOOT. This is a compensatory increase given for the rate voted on hemp and hemp tow.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator had no doubt that we would vote that increase and so he provided for it here?

Mr. SMOOT. The committee voted it, and after it voted the increase on hemp and hemp tow it could not do anything else than give the compensatory duty upon the manufactured article.

Mr. COPELAND. Then, that means that there will be an increase in cost of threads and twines and cords and all those things made of flax and hemp or any of these mixtures. We will have to pay more for everything with which we tie up these bundles of rags that were spoken of by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORMAN]. Is not that true?

Mr. SMOOT. It has nothing to do with rags.

Mr. COPELAND. I am not sure. I think it will promote the rags of the American people. They will have to pay more for everything they buy and we will have more rags.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not want the American manufacturer to pay more for his hemp and hemp tow and then have a less rate upon the manufactured goods?

Mr. COPELAND. No. I voted against the other provision in the minority, of course, and now I shall have to vote against this amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. That is all right.

Mr. COPELAND. But I want the American people to know that because of what we are doing here to-night, every time they buy some twine or cord to tie up their packages they are going to pay more because the subcommittee did not have stamina enough to stand out against an increased rate on hemp. They gave in because they thought that it was something raised on the farm. I stand here as a friend of the farmer, but it is ridiculous, it is outrageous to think that we are hav-

ing these increases in the prices to be paid for such things as are made from these products. Of course, the Senate is going to adopt the amendment and it is utterly useless for me to try to stop it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 163, line 5, before the words "per pound," to strike out "2½ cents" and insert "2 cents," so as to read:

PAR. 1005. (a) Cordage, including cables, tarred or untarred, composed of three or more strands, each strand composed of two or more yarns:

(1) Wholly or in chief value of manilla (abaca), sisal, henequen, or other hard fiber, 2 cents per pound; and in addition thereto, on any of the foregoing smaller than three-fourths of 1 inch in diameter, 15 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 163, line 22, after the word "duty," to strike out "per pound as the highest rate" and insert "as is," so as to make the paragraph read:

PAR. 1006. Gill nettings, nets, webs, and seines, and other nets for fishing, wholly or in chief value of flax, hemp, or ramie, and not specially provided for, shall be subject to the same duty as is imposed in this act upon any of the thread, twines, or cord of which the mesh is made, and in addition thereto 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, what is the significance of this amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator will notice that we changed the specific in subparagraph (b) on page 162. We cut out all of the specific rates and made them ad valorem.

Mr. COPELAND. Does that mean for all of these gill nettings, nets, webs, and seines, and other nets for fishing, we will have to pay a higher price?

Mr. SMOOT. No; the provision is that they shall be subject to the same duty as is imposed in this act upon any of the thread, twines, or cord of which the mesh is made. There is only one rate imposed in the bill and it is simply a clerical amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 165, line 10, before the words "ad valorem," to strike out "55 per cent" and insert "45 per cent," so as to read:

(c) Woven fabrics, in the piece or otherwise, wholly or in chief value of vegetable fiber, except cotton, filled, coated, or otherwise prepared for use as artists' canvases, 45 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 166, line 8, after the word "and," to strike out "20" and insert "60," so as to read:

PAR. 1014. Towels and napkins, finished or unfinished, wholly or in chief value of flax, hemp, or ramie, or of which these substances or any of them is the component material of chief value, not exceeding 160 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, 55 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, what does this mean, may I ask the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMOOT. It simply increases the thread count. It was 120 and we put it up to 160 per square inch. In other words, the 160 count to the square inch is a finer thread than the House provided for in the paragraph.

The finer the thread, of course, the higher the cost will be. We have provided for the higher-priced products in a different way at the same rate. For instance, the clause which reads:

Towels, napkins, finished and unfinished, wholly or in chief value of flax, hemp, ramie, or of which these substances or any of them is the component material of chief value, not exceeding 160 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, 55 per cent ad valorem.

Without the amendment that provision only included towels and napkins that had 120 picks or threads to the square inch. I call them "picks," because that is the usual term in manufacturing. We have increased the threads so that the finer towels up to 160 threads can come in at 55 per cent.

Mr. COPELAND. I take it from the happy manner of the Senator that somehow or other this must mean that it is good

for the people. I will inquire of him if it is good for the people.

Mr. SMOOT. In the past the American manufacturer in making towels and napkins has made them of yarn not to exceed 120 threads to the square inch. Lately, in order to compete with the foreign products, they have been making towels 160 threads to the inch, using a finer thread and making a finer towel. We met the situation by leaving the rate just as it is on the ordinary towel and putting in provision covering the finer towel at the same rate.

In other words, 120 picks was the limit under the existing law, whereas under the pending bill we say to American manufacturers, "You can use 160 threads to the square inch, and make a finer towel, and the rate of duty will be 55 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. What is happening now illustrates the folly or the mistake of unduly long sessions and of night sessions. We are galloping through a schedule that is full of increases. On the item of yarns which we considered a few moments ago, the increase amounts to 8 cents per pound for every pound of yarn imported into this country.

Let us see what the pending amendment does; let us see what its effect is. It is merely a change of phraseology upon its face, but it so shifts the duty upon the imports that the result, according to the information furnished me by the Tariff Commission, is:

Although the actual rates of duty have not been changed in this paragraph, a change in phraseology affecting the specifications operates to increase the amount of duty collectible from \$1,449,642 under the provisions of the act of 1922 to \$1,749,642 under the provisions of H. R. 2667 (both House and Senate).

In other words, what we are doing here in two or three minutes' time is to increase a duty that will take \$300,000 a year out of the American consumers who buy imported napkins and towels.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to what I believe is a mistake on his part. I think this does not increase the duty; it leaves the duty just where it is on towels and napkins not exceeding 120 threads to the square inch, but adds another class not exceeding 160 threads to the square inch. It does not raise the duty, but it will bring in under this duty more value because the limit as to threads is increased.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Exactly.

Mr. NORRIS. If it increases the rate, I would agree with the Senator, but the value of the importations under this bracket, if it may be called a bracket, will be greater with this amendment than without it. However, the rate is not increased.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It rearranges the bracket, and it does increase the amount of duty that the people have to pay and therefore increases the rate.

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator is mistaken, as I look at it, though I know the Senator is acting in the best of faith, and so am I. It will increase the duty collected under this bracket, but it will lower the duty under some other bracket. The limit is increased from 120 threads to 160 threads, or 40 threads.

They now come in as the law is written under some other rate, and, as I understand, at a higher rate than the duty provided for in this amendment. So, as a matter of fact, the rate of duty on all the items will be decreased, but the amount of revenue collected under this bracket will be increased, because the bracket is broadened out without increasing the rate.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Is it not true that as the result of broadening out the bracket the consumers who import napkins and towels will have to pay more duty?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not so understand; I think not.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, let me explain the amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Why should the Tariff Commission give me this information, if it is not correct?

Mr. SMOOT. That is only one-half of it. We can not increase the threads covered by the first bracket unless we take them out of the other bracket.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Nearly all of the napkins and towels could come in under the one bracket and not under the other at all.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. I want to ask the Senator from Utah a question. Under the present law, do not towels and napkins under 120 threads to the square inch pay a duty of 55 per cent? That is true, is it not?

Mr. SMOOT. That is correct.

Mr. HARRISON. Under this amendment, if the material does not exceed 160 threads it pays a duty of 55 per cent?

Mr. SMOOT. That is right.

Mr. HARRISON. And under the present law if the material exceeds 120 threads it pays a duty of 40 per cent?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; that is true.

Mr. HARRISON. So all towels and napkins between 120 threads and 160 threads under the present law pay a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem, whereas under this amendment they will pay a duty of 55 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator from Mississippi is right, then the Senator from Massachusetts was right, and I was wrong in the conclusion which I drew.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I assumed from what the Senator from Utah had said that the present duty where the number of threads exceeded 120 and was less than 160 was more than 55 per cent ad valorem. Now he says it is less; that it is 40 per cent. That being true, of course, the reverse of what I said is true. I drew the wrong conclusion because I started with an assumption that was erroneous.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. The statistics show that the importations of these particular articles are almost twice the production in this country. I presume those interested wanted this increase of duty on threads between 120 and 160 and demanded this increase in order to keep the foreign goods out.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am very much inclined to suggest the absence of a quorum, because here we are with less than a majority of the Senate present, with even the leader of the farm bloc absent when farm rates are being considered and with everybody so confused that we do not know whether a given amendment proposes an increase or a decrease. The situation which we now have proves what I have said time and time again, that the Senate is not under present conditions physically and mentally competent to legislate. Even the Young Turks, with all their vigor, are absent; furthermore, a majority of the members of the Finance Committee, even those who framed this schedule, are conspicuous by their absence; half of the Senators are absent, and yet we are proposing to go forward and pass a bill revising the tariff, although we are so confused that we do not know whether this particular amendment involves an increase or a decrease.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like very much now to bring the session to a close.

Mr. COPELAND. I yield for that purpose.

FUNERAL OF THE LATE SECRETARY OF WAR—RECESS

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Hon. James W. Good, Secretary of War, and also for the purpose of allowing Senators to attend his funeral to-morrow, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 1 o'clock p. m.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, November 20, 1929, at 1 o'clock p. m.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, November 20, 1929

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 30, 1929)

The Senate met at 1 o'clock p. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. WALSH of Montana obtained the floor.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Fletcher	Kendrick	Shortridge
Ashurst	Frazier	Keyes	Simmons
Barkley	George	La Follette	Smith
Bingham	Gillett	McCulloch	Smoot
Black	Glass	McKellar	Steck
Blaine	Goff	McMaster	Steiwer
Blease	Goldsborough	McNary	Stephens
Borah	Greene	Moses	Swanson
Bratton	Hale	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Brock	Harris	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Harrison	Nye	Townsend
Broussard	Hastings	Oddie	Trammell
Capper	Hatfield	Overman	Tydings
Caraway	Hawes	Patterson	Vandenberg
Connally	Hayden	Pittman	Wagner
Copeland	Hebert	Pittman	Walcott
Couzens	Hedin	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Cutting	Howell	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Johnson	Sackett	Waterman
Dill	Jones	Schall	
Fess	Kean	Sheppard	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] is entitled to the floor.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, it must be obvious to all that it is quite impossible for the Senate to complete the consideration of the unfinished business, the tariff bill, before the assembling of the regular session. Accordingly, there is no reason, in my judgment, why we should not have a brief recess preparatory to the work of the coming session. It ought to be had for reasons which have heretofore been adverted to and which need not now be repeated. It might also be said that it is the custom of practically all the Members of the Senate to come here at least a week before the general session to prepare for that work.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I offer this morning a concurrent resolution providing that the present session shall be brought to a close on Friday next. I send the concurrent resolution to the desk and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. No. 19), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be authorized to close the present session of the Congress by adjourning their respective Houses on Friday, November 22, 1929, at the following hours, namely: The Senate at the hour of 10 o'clock p. m., and the House at such hour as it may by order provide.

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. ALLEN. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRATTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], but I am informed that if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote. I therefore am at liberty to cast my vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I transfer the general pair which I have with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH. I have a pair on this question with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE]. I transfer the pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] and vote "yea."

Mr. TYDINGS. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF]. I transfer the pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SCHALL. My colleague [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is still ill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is unavoidably detained by illness.